arXiv:1510.08732v1 [math.PR] 29 Oct 2015

Taylor schemes for rough differential equations and fractional diffusions

Yaozhong Hu[*], Yanghui Liu, David Nualart[†]
Department of Mathematics
The University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas, 66045 USA

Abstract

In this paper, we study two variations of the time discrete Taylor schemes for rough differential equations and for stochastic differential equations driven by fractional Brownian motions. One is the incomplete Taylor scheme which excludes some terms of an Taylor scheme in its recursive computation so as to reduce the computation time. The other one is to add some deterministic terms to an incomplete Taylor scheme to improve the mean rate of convergence. Almost sure rate of convergence and L_p-rate of convergence are obtained for the incomplete Taylor schemes. Almost sure rate is expressed in terms of the Hölder exponents of the driving signals and the L_p-rate is expressed by the Hurst parameters. Both rates involves with the incomplete Taylor scheme in a very explicit way and then provide us with the best incomplete schemes, depending on that one needs the almost sure convergence or one needs L_p-convergence. As in the smooth case, general Taylor schemes are always complicated to deal with. The incomplete Taylor scheme is even more sophisticated to analyze. A new feature of our approach is the explicit expression of the error functions which will be easier to study. Estimates for multiple integrals and formulas for the iterated vector fields are obtained to analyze the error functions and then to obtain the rates of convergence.

1 Introduction

Consider the d-dimensional differential equation

$$dy_t = V(y_t)dx_t, \quad t \in [0,T], \quad y_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $x = (x^1, \dots, x^m)$ is Hölder continuous of order $\beta > 1/2$ and $V = (V_j^i)_{1\le i\le d, 1\le j\le m}$ is a continuous mapping from $\mathbb{R}^d$ to $\mathbb{R}^{d\times m}$. It is well-known (see [11] and [15]) that if V is continuously differentiable and its partial derivatives are bounded and locally Hölder continuous of order $\delta > \frac{1}{\beta} - 1$, then equation (1.1) has a unique solution that is Hölder continuous of order β.

Our goal in this paper is to study numerical approximations for the solution of equation (1.1). We briefly recall the way to obtain some general numerical approximation schemes for equation (1.1).

Assume that V has sufficient regularity. A simple Taylor expansion (iterated application of chain rule) leads, when t is sufficiently close to s, to the following approximation

$$y_t \approx y_s + \mathcal{E}_{s,t}^{(N)}(y_s), \tag{1.2}$$

[*]Y. Hu is partially supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation #209206.
[†]D. Nualart is supported by the NSF grant DMS 1512891 and the ARO grant FED0070445.
Keywords. Rough differential equations, numerical approximation scheme, convergence rate, generalized Leibniz rule, multiple integrals, fractional Brownian motion.

where

$$\mathcal{E}_{s,t}^{(N)}(y) \;:=\; \sum_{r=1}^{N} \sum_{(j_1,\ldots,j_r)\in\Gamma_r} \mathcal{V}_{j_1}\cdots\mathcal{V}_{j_r} I(y) \int_s^t \int_s^{u_r} \cdots \int_s^{u_2} dx_{u_1}^{j_1}\cdots dx_{u_r}^{j_r}\,, \quad y\in\mathbb{R}^d\,.$$

In this expression, Γ_r is the collection of multi-indices of length r with elements in $\{1,2,\ldots,m\}$, I is the identity function ($I(y)=y$) from $\mathbb{R}^d$ to $\mathbb{R}^d$, and $\mathcal{V}_j$ is the vector field

$$\mathcal{V}_j f = \sum_{i=1}^{d} V_j^i \partial_i f, \quad j=1,\ldots,m, \tag{1.3}$$

where ∂_i denotes the differential operator $\frac{\partial}{\partial y^i}$, $i=1,\ldots,d$ (we refer the reader to [1, 2, 6] for more details; [6] gives a Taylor expansion with explicit form of the residual).

Let $0=t_0<t_1<\cdots<t_n=T$ be any partition of the interval $[0,T]$. On the interval $[t_k,t_{k+1}]$, we may use $y_{t_k}^n+\mathcal{E}_{t_k,t}^{(N)}(y_{t_k}^n)$ to approximate y_t. We iterate this on each subinterval of the partition to obtain the following recursive scheme for (1.1),

$$y_t^n \;=\; y_{t_k}^n+\mathcal{E}_{t_k,t}^{(N)}(y_{t_k}^n), \quad t\in[t_k,t_{k+1}], \tag{1.4}$$

for $k=0,1,\ldots,n-1$, with $y_0^n=y_0$, In this paper, we shall take $t_k=\frac{T}{n}k$, $k=0,1\ldots,n$. The recursive scheme (1.4) can also be written as

$$y_t^n \;=\; y_0+\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor\frac{nt}{T}\rfloor} \mathcal{E}_{t_k,t_{k+1}\wedge t}^{(N)}(y_{t_k}^n)\,, \tag{1.5}$$

where $a\wedge b$ is the smaller of the numbers a and b and $\lfloor a\rfloor$ is the integer part of a. The recursive scheme (1.4) is usually called the *time discrete Taylor scheme* or simply *Taylor scheme*, of order N. Note that the interpolation on each interval $[t_k,t_{k+1}]$ used in (1.4) and (1.5) guarantees that the numerical scheme has the same convergence rate at non-discretization points $t\in[0,T]\setminus D$ as at the discretization points $t\in D=\{\frac{k}{n}T,\, k=0,1,\ldots,n\}$.

Taylor scheme (1.5) has been considered in [3] when x is a *weak geometric p-rough path* (see Section 7), $p\geq 1$. It is proved that under some additional regularity assumptions on V, for $N\geq\lfloor p\rfloor$, the rate of convergence of y_t^n to y_t is $n^{1-(N+1)/p}$. Clearly, the larger the N in (1.5) is the higher will be the convergence rate. If $N=1$, then (1.5) is reduced to the classical Euler scheme

$$y_t^n = y_{t_k}^n+V(y_{t_k}^n)(x_t-x_{t_k}), \quad t\in[t_k,t_{k+1}], \tag{1.6}$$

for $k=0,1,\ldots,n-1$, with $y_0^n=y_0$. This classical Euler scheme has been studied, for instance, in [7, 13, 14].

Remark 1.1 *With an abuse of notation we shall use the same notation y_t^n to denote the approximation obtained by different schemes when there is no confusion.*

When one of the driving signals x is the time, say $x^1(t)=t$, and when the others are independent standard Brownian motions, an important scheme is the so-called Milstein scheme, which has the following form

$$y_t^n \;=\; y_{t_k}^n+\bar{\mathcal{E}}_{t_k,t}(y_{t_k}^n)\,, \quad t\in[t_k,t_{k+1}], \tag{1.7}$$

for $k=0,1,\ldots,n-1$, with $y_0^n=y_0$, where

$$\bar{\mathcal{E}}_{s,t}(y) \;:=\; \sum_{j\in\Gamma_1} \mathcal{V}_j I(y)\int_s^t dx_u^j + \sum_{(j,j')\in\bar{\Gamma}_2} \mathcal{V}_j\mathcal{V}_{j'} I(y)\int_s^t\int_s^{u'} dx_u^j dx_{u'}^{j'}$$

and $\bar{\Gamma}_2 = \{(j,j') \in \Gamma_2 : j,j' = 2,\dots,m\}$. This scheme does not include the terms $\int_s^t \int_s^u dx_v^j dx_u^{j'}$, where one or both of the j and j' are 1. In the Brownian motion case, it is well-known that the Milstein scheme has the same rate of convergence as the order 2 Taylor scheme while it requires fewer computations.

This motivates us to ask the following question.

Question 1. How to eliminate as many terms as possible in $\mathcal{E}_{s,t}^{(N)}(y)$ while keeping the same rate of convergence? More precisely, we want to find subsets $\widetilde{\Gamma}_r \subseteq \Gamma_r$ so that $\widetilde{\Gamma}_r$ contains as few elements as possible and when we replace $\mathcal{E}_{t_k,t_{k+1}\wedge t}^{(N)}\left(y_{t_k}^n\right)$ in the Taylor scheme (1.5) by $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{t_k,t_{k+1}\wedge t}^{(N)}\left(y_{t_k}^n\right)$, we have the same rate of convergence as that of the original one. Here

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{s,t}^{(N)}(y) \;:=\; \sum_{r=1}^{N} \sum_{(j_1,\dots,j_r)\in\widetilde{\Gamma}_r} \mathcal{V}_{j_1}\cdots\mathcal{V}_{j_r} I(y) \int_s^t \int_s^{u_r} \cdots \int_s^{u_2} dx_{u_1}^{j_1}\cdots dx_{u_r}^{j_r}\,. \tag{1.8}$$

We shall call such new Taylor scheme an *incomplete Taylor scheme*, which has the following form:

$$y_t^n \;=\; y_{t_k}^n + \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{t_k,t}^{(N)}(y_{t_k}^n), \quad t\in[t_k,t_{k+1}], \tag{1.9}$$

for $k = 0,1,\dots,n-1$, with $y_0^n = y_0$.

We shall study the rate of convergence of y_t^n to y_t for any choice of $\widetilde{\Gamma}_r$ in (1.8). Two types of convergence will be studied in detail: almost sure convergence (when the x^j are Hölder continuous with exponents β_j) and the L_p-convergence (when the x^j are fractional Brownian motions of Hurst parameters H_j). The rates will be different for these two types of convergence. Fix a set

$$\widetilde{\Gamma} = \cup_{r=1}^N \widetilde{\Gamma}_r, \quad N = \max\{|\alpha| \,:\, \alpha\in\widetilde{\Gamma}\}\,,$$

where throughout the paper $|\alpha|$ denotes the length of the multi-index α. The almost sure rate $\theta_{\widetilde{\Gamma}}$ can be expressed in terms of β_j (see (4.2) below) and the L_p-rate $\rho_{\widetilde{\Gamma}}$ can be expressed in term of Hurst parameters H_j (see (6.3) below). These two expressions lead to the best choices of $\widetilde{\Gamma}_r$ in (1.8), depending on that one needs the almost sure convergence ($\widetilde{\Gamma}_r$ is given by (4.6) in Section 4) or one needs L_p-convergence ($\widetilde{\Gamma}_r$ is given by (6.12) in Section 6).

To motivate our second problem, let us recall that when the driving signals are fractional Brownian motions of Hurst parameter $H > 1/2$, the classical Euler scheme (1.6) has the exact convergence rate n^{1-2H} (see [7, 14]). When we formally equal H to $1/2$ (the standard Brownian motion case), we obtain no convergence! This demonstrates on one hand, that in dealing with the incomplete Taylor schemes we may not be able to use the same ideas from the Brownian motion case ([5, 10]). This is largely due to the lack of the martingale property of the driving signals. We will pay special attention to this fact. On the other hand, to improve the Euler scheme for the fractional Brownian motion case, a modified Euler scheme is proposed and investigated in [7]:

$$y_t^n = y_{t_k}^n + V(y_{t_k}^n)(x_t - x_{t_k}) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^m (\partial V_j V_j)(y_{t_k}^n)(t-t_k)^{2H}\,, \quad t\in[t_k,t_{k+1}], \tag{1.10}$$

for $k = 0,1,\dots,n-1$, with $y_0^n = y_0$. Here we denote $V = (V_1,\dots,V_m)$. It has been shown that this modified Euler scheme has a higher rate of convergence than the classical Euler scheme. In particular, it is proved in [7] that for any $t\in[0,T]$,

$$\mathbb{E}(|y_t - y_t^n|^p)^{1/p} \;\le\; \begin{cases} Kn^{1/2-2H} & \text{if} \quad \frac{1}{2} < H < \frac{3}{4}\,, \\ Kn^{-1}\sqrt{\log n} & \text{if} \quad H = \frac{3}{4}\,, \\ Kn^{-1} & \text{if} \quad \frac{3}{4} < H < 1\,, \end{cases} \tag{1.11}$$

under proper regularity assumptions on V, where K is a constant independent of n.

The scheme (1.10) is obtained by adding to the classical Euler scheme (1.6) a deterministic term (note that for simplicity, we assume here that x is a standard m-dimensional fractional Brownian motion). The inclusion in (1.10) of the deterministic terms $\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^{m}(\partial V_j V_j)(y^n_{t_k})(t-t_k)^{2H}$, as opposed to double integral terms as in (1.7), helps to save computation time due to the evaluation of double stochastic integrals. It is then natural to ask the following question:

Question 2. Can we add some deterministic terms to the incomplete Taylor scheme (1.9) so as to increase the rate of convergence?

We shall answer this question in the case when the x^j's are fractional Brownian motions or $x^j_t = t$ by introducing the following *modified Taylor scheme*:

$$y^n_t = y^n_{t_k} + \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(N)}_{t_k,t}(y^n_{t_k}) + \sum_{(j_1,\dots,j_r)\in\Gamma'} \mathcal{V}_{j_1}\cdots\mathcal{V}_{j_r} I(y^n_{t_k}) D_{j_1,\dots,j_r}(t-t_k), \tag{1.12}$$

for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$, $y^n_0 = y_0$. The above set Γ' is a finite subset of $\Gamma \setminus \widetilde{\Gamma}$, where $\Gamma = \bigcup_{r=1}^{\infty}\Gamma_r$ and $\widetilde{\Gamma} = \bigcup_{r=1}^{N}\widetilde{\Gamma}_r$, that will be given explicitly in Section 6.2. The explicit form of $D_{j_1,\dots,j_r}(t)$, $t \in [0,T]$, is given in Remark 5.16.

The main tasks of this paper are to establish the almost sure and the L_p-rate of convergence results for the incomplete Taylor scheme (1.9) and the modified Taylor scheme (1.12). It is worthy to emphasize that the modified Taylor scheme (1.12) has a higher L_p-rate of convergence than the incomplete Taylor scheme (1.9) (compare Theorem 6.12 with Theorem 6.3). We also point out that our result extends that of [7]: in the simplest case $N = 1$, our result recovers the upper bound estimate (1.11) (see Example 6.14).

The remainder of the Taylor expansion (1.2) has an involved expression (see [1]). If we throw some terms away, then the remainder is even more complicated. In the study of the convergence rate for the schemes (1.9) and (1.12) it is necessary to investigate this type of remainders. We shall express the error in the following form:

$$y_t - y^n_t = \Phi_t^{-1}\int_0^t \Phi_s dR_s, \tag{1.13}$$

where $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ is the solution of a linear differential equation, Φ^{-1} is its inverse, that is, $\Phi\Phi^{-1} \equiv I$, and R_t is the remainder term, whose upper bound usually provides the desired convergence rate. The study of (1.13) is based on the algebraic properties of equation (1.1), which are interesting in its own right (see Section 2.1-2.3). It is well know that for $i_1, \dots, i_r$, $j_1, \dots, j_{r'} = 1, \dots, m$, the product $\int_s^t \cdots \int_s^{u_2} dx^{i_1}_{u_1}\cdots dx^{i_r}_{u_r}$ and $\int_s^t \cdots \int_s^{u_2} dx^{j_1}_{u_1}\cdots dx^{j_{r'}}_{u_{r'}}$ is equal to the summation of integrals of the form $\int_s^t \cdots \int_s^{u_2} dx^{l_1}_{u_1}\cdots dx^{l_{r+r'}}_{u_{r+r'}}$, where the summation runs over the multi-indices $(l_1, \dots, l_{r+r'})$ obtained by shuffling the two multi-indices $(i_1, \dots, i_r)$ and $(j_1, \dots, j_{r'})$. The study of the error function R_t needs an expansion of the multiple integral $\int_\tau^s \int_\tau^{s_p} \cdots \int_\tau^{s_2} dg^{\gamma^1}_{\tau,s_1}\cdots dg^{\gamma^{p-1}}_{\tau,s_{p-1}} dg^{\gamma^p}_{\tau,s_p}$, where each $g^{\gamma}_{\tau,s}$ is itself a multiple integral. This expansion of multiple integral of the multiple integrals can also be done by the shuffle-type permutations. A key ingredient in our proof is to establish a relation between these shuffle-type permutations with the permutations when we expand the iterated vector fields $\mathcal{V}_{j_1}\cdots\mathcal{V}_{j_r}I(y)$ through a generalized Leibniz rule (see Propositions 2.5, 2.10 and 2.11).

To obtain the rate of convergence for the modified Taylor scheme (1.12) we need some subtle L_2-estimates of a multiple Riemann-Stieltjes integral

$$J_r(\mathcal{A}) \;:=\; \int_0^T \cdots \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}} dB^1_{s_1}\cdots dB^r_{s_r},$$

and its centralization

$$\widetilde{J}_r(\mathcal{A}) \;:=\; J_r(\mathcal{A}) - \mathbb{E}[J_r(\mathcal{A})],$$

for $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{k=0}^{n-1}\{(s_1,\dots,s_r) : t_k \le s_1 < \cdots < s_r \le t_{k+1}\}$, where B^j, $j = 1,\dots,r$ is either a fractional Brownian motion with Hurst parameter larger than 1/2 or the identity function. Note that $J_r(\mathcal{A})$ is well defined as an integrated Riemann-Stieltjes integral. The L_2-estimates are made possible by a monotonicity property of the multiple integral obtained in Section 5.3; that is, for $\mathcal{A}' = \bigcup_{k=0}^{n-1}[t_k, t_{k+1}]^r$, the L_2-norms of $J_r(\mathcal{A})$ and $\widetilde{J}_r(\mathcal{A})$ are less than those of $J_r(\mathcal{A}')$ and $\widetilde{J}_r(\mathcal{A}')$, respectively (see Sections 5.3 and 5.4).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce some shuffle-type permutations and then apply them to expand the multiple integral of the multiple integrals and we also derive a generalized Leibniz rule for iterated vector fields. With these preparations we derive, in Section 3, an explicit expression for the error function for the scheme (1.9). In Section 4, we obtain the almost sure convergence rate for the scheme (1.9). In Section 5, we prove some L_p-estimate results. These estimates are applied to obtain the L_p-convergence rate for the incomplete scheme (1.9) in subsection 6.1 and the L_p-convergence rate for the modified Taylor scheme (1.12) in subsection 6.2. In Section 7, we generalize the results in Section 3 to the rough paths case. In the appendix, we provide some necessary estimates of some multiple integrals and the solution of some differential equations.

Along the paper we denote by C a generic constant, that may be different form line to line, and which might depend on T and the vector fields V_j^i.

2 Multiple integral of multiple integrals and generalized Leibniz rule

The primary aim of this section is to prove an identity on multiple integral of multiple integrals (see Proposition 2.10) and a generalized Leibniz rule (see Proposition 2.11). To do so, we need to introduce some shuffle-type permutations and their inverses (see Section 2.1).

2.1 Shuffle-type permutations and their inverses

Let $\alpha = (\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_r) \in \Gamma_r$, where Γ_r is the collection of multi-indices of length r with elements in $\{1,\dots,m\}$. Take $\vec{l} = (l_1,\dots,l_p)$ such that $1 \le l_1 < \cdots < l_p = r$, $p \le r$. Assume that $f_j^i \in C^{r-p}(\mathbb{R})$, $i = 1,\dots,p$, $j = 1,\dots,m$. As a motivation, we first consider the following expression:

$$\mathcal{V}_{\alpha_{0,l_1}}\left(f^1_{\alpha_{l_1}}\cdots\mathcal{V}_{\alpha_{l_{p-2},l_{p-1}}}\left(f^{p-1}_{\alpha_{l_{p-1}}}\mathcal{V}_{\alpha_{l_{p-1},l_p}}f^p_{\alpha_{l_p}}\right)\right). \tag{2.1}$$

Here we denote $\alpha_{i,j} := (\alpha_{i+1},\dots,\alpha_{j-1})$, $\mathcal{V}_{j_1,\dots,j_k} := \mathcal{V}_{j_1}\cdots\mathcal{V}_{j_k}$, and recall that $\mathcal{V}_j$ is the differential operator defined in (1.3). Note that the subindex of α in each element in (2.1), either an operator or a function, identifies the location of this element in (2.1). For example, $\mathcal{V}_{\alpha_j}$ is the jth element and $f^i_{\alpha_{l_i}}$ is the l_ith element.

It is easy to verify that $\mathcal{V}_j$ satisfies the product rule, that is, $\mathcal{V}_j(fg) = g\mathcal{V}_j f + f\mathcal{V}_j g$ for $f, g \in C^1$. By applying the product rule to (2.1), the operators $\mathcal{V}_{\alpha_j}$, $j \in \{1,\dots,r\}\setminus\{l_1,\dots,l_p\}$ act on functions $f^i_{\alpha_{l_i}}$, $i = 1,\dots,p$, in such a way that:
(i) for j such that $l_{i-1} < j < l_i$, the operator $\mathcal{V}_{\alpha_j}$ act on one of the functions $f^i_{\alpha_i}$, …, $f^p_{\alpha_p}$;
(ii) if two operators $\mathcal{V}_i$ and $\mathcal{V}_j$ act on the same function $f^k_{\alpha_{l_k}}$ then their order in (2.1) is kept.

Note that we take $l_0 = 0$ in (i). The quantity (2.1) is then expanded into the summation of quantities of the following form,

$$\left(\mathcal{V}_{\alpha'_{0,\tau_1}}f^1_{\alpha'_{\tau_1}}\right)\cdots\left(\mathcal{V}_{\alpha'_{\tau_{p-1},\tau_p}}f^p_{\alpha'_{\tau_p}}\right), \tag{2.2}$$

where α' is some permutation of α such that $\alpha'_{\tau_i} = \alpha_{l_i}$, $i = 1,\dots,p$, and $(\tau_1,\dots,\tau_p)$ are constants such that $1 \le \tau_1 < \cdots < \tau_p = r$. Denote by $\mu(i)$ the new location of the ith element of (2.1) in (2.2),

then μ is the permutation of $\{1,2,\ldots,r\}$ such that $\alpha = \alpha' \circ \mu$. In particular, we have $\mu(l_i) = \tau_i$, $i = 1,\ldots,p$. Each quantity of the form (2.2) obtained from applying the product rule to (2.1) is then identified with a permutation μ on $\{1,\ldots,r\}$. It is easy to see that these permutations satisfy:

Rule 1. $\mu(l_i) < \mu(l_{i+1})$, $i = 1,\ldots,p$;

Rule 2. $\mu(y) < \mu(y')$ *if* $y < y'$ *and* $\mu(y), \mu(y') \in I_i$ *for some* i, *where* $(I_i,\ i = 1,\ldots,p)$ *is the partition of* $\{1,\ldots,r\}$ *defined as follows*

$$I_1 = \{1,\ldots,\mu(l_1)\};\quad I_i = \{\mu(l_{i-1})+1,\ldots,\mu(l_i)\},\quad i = 2,\ldots,p\,. \tag{2.3}$$

In fact, Rule 2 is the "translation" of condition (ii) in terms of μ and Rule 1 is required to fix the ordering of the terms $\left(\mathcal{V}_{\alpha'_{\tau_{i-1},\tau_i}} f^1_{\alpha'_{\tau_i}}\right)$, $i = 1,\ldots,p$, in (2.2).

The "translation" of condition (i) in terms of μ is:

Rule 3. $\mu(l_{i-1}) < \mu(y)$ *if* $\ l_{i-1} < y < l_i$.

This rule is implied by Rule 1 and 2:

Lemma 2.1 *Assume that* μ *is a permutation of* $\{1,\ldots,r\}$ *that satisfies Rule 1 and 2. Then* μ *also satisfies Rule 3.*

Proof We take y such that $l_{i-1} < y$. Since μ is a bijection, we have $\mu(l_{i-1}) \neq \mu(y)$. Suppose that $\mu(l_{i-1}) > \mu(y)$. Then there exists j such that $\mu(l_j), \mu(y) \in I_j$ and $\mu(l_{i-1}) \geq \mu(l_j) > \mu(y)$. By Rule 2 we have $l_j > y$. On the other hand, Rule 1 implies that $l_{i-1} \geq l_j$. So we obtain $l_{i-1} > y$, which contradicts the assumption. □

We are ready to define the shuffle-type permutations.

Definition 2.2 *Take* $\vec{l} = (l_1,\ldots,l_p)$ *such that* $1 \leq l_1 < \cdots < l_p = r$. *We define* $\Theta_r(\vec{l})$ *as the collection of all permutations of* $\{1,\ldots,r\}$ *that satisfy Rule 1 and 2. Take* $\vec{\tau} = (\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_p)$ *such that* $1 \leq \tau_1 < \cdots < \tau_p = r$. *We define* $\Theta_r(\vec{l};\vec{\tau})$ *as the collection of permutations in* $\Theta_r(\vec{l})$ *such that* $\mu(l_i) = \tau_i$, $i = 1,\ldots,p$.

Note that the set $\Theta_r(\vec{l};\vec{\tau})$ could be empty for some $l_1,\ldots,l_p$ and $\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_p$.

According to the above discussion, we have the following result:

Lemma 2.3 *Take* $\alpha = (\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_r) \in \Gamma_r$, $\vec{l} = (l_1,\ldots,l_p)$ *such that* $1 \leq l_1 < \cdots < l_p = r$ *and* $f^i_j \in C^{r-p}$, $i = 1,\ldots,p$, $j = 1,\ldots,m$. *Then the quantity (2.1) is equal to*

$$\sum_{\mu\in\Theta_r(\vec{l})} \left(\mathcal{V}_{\alpha\circ\mu^{-1}(0,\mu(l_1))} f^1_{\alpha_{l_1}}\right)\cdots\left(\mathcal{V}_{\alpha\circ\mu^{-1}(\mu(l_{p-1}),\mu(l_p))} f^p_{\alpha_{l_p}}\right)$$

or

$$\sum_{1\leq\tau_1<\cdots<\tau_p=r}\ \sum_{\mu\in\Theta_r(\vec{l};\vec{\tau})} \left(\mathcal{V}_{\alpha\circ\mu^{-1}(0,\tau_1)} f^1_{\alpha\circ\mu^{-1}(\tau_1)}\right)\cdots\left(\mathcal{V}_{\alpha\circ\mu^{-1}(\tau_{p-1},\tau_p)} f^p_{\alpha\circ\mu^{-1}(\tau_p)}\right).$$

The proof of the lemma is omitted. Please note that in the above summation, when $\Theta_r(\vec{l};\,\vec{\tau}\,) = \emptyset$, we follow the convention that a summation over the empty set is 0.

We introduce another type of permutations, which will be the inverses of those in $\Theta_r(\vec{l})$. Let $\tau_0 = 0$ and $\vec{\tau} = (\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_p)$ be the same as in Definition 2.2, and define the partition on $\{1,\ldots,r\}$ given by

$$I_i = \{\tau_{i-1}+1,\ldots,\tau_i\}\,,\quad i = 1,\ldots,p\,. \tag{2.4}$$

Definition 2.4 *Let $\vec{l}$ and $\vec{\tau}$ be as in Definition 2.2. We define $\Xi_r(\vec{\tau})$ as the collection of permutations ρ on $\{1,2,\dots,r\}$ such that ρ keeps the ordering of $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_p$, i.e. the last elements of $I_1,\dots,I_p$, and the order of the elements in each I_i. In other words, $\rho \in \Xi_r(\vec{\tau})$ iff ρ satisfies*

Rule 4. *$\rho(\tau_i) < \rho(\tau_j)$ if $i < j$;*

Rule 5. *$\rho(y) < \rho(y')$ if $y, y' \in I_i$ and $y < y'$.*

We define $\Xi_r(\vec{l};\vec{\tau})$ as the collection of permutations ρ in $\Xi_r(\vec{\tau})$ such that $\rho(\tau_i) = l_i$, $i = 1,\dots,p$.

Note that for $\rho \in \Xi_r(\vec{\tau})$ we always have $\rho(\tau_p) = \rho(r) = r$.

The following proposition shows that the permutations introduced in Definitions 2.2 and 2.4 are inverses of each other.

Proposition 2.5 *Let $\vec{l}$ and $\vec{\tau}$ be as in Definition 2.2. Suppose that at least one of the two sets $\Xi_r(\vec{l};\vec{\tau})$ and $\Theta_r(\vec{l};\vec{\tau})$ is not empty. Then the following holds,*

$$\Xi_r(\vec{l};\vec{\tau}) = \{\rho : \rho^{-1} \in \Theta_r(\vec{l};\vec{\tau})\}. \tag{2.5}$$

Remark 2.6 *It follows from Proposition 2.5 that $\Xi_r(\vec{l};\vec{\tau}) = \emptyset$ if and only if $\Theta_r(\vec{l};\vec{\tau}) = \emptyset$.*

Remark 2.7 *Equation (2.5) is equivalent to the following,*

$$\Theta_r(\vec{l};\vec{\tau}) = \{\mu : \mu^{-1} \in \Xi_r(\vec{l};\vec{\tau})\}.$$

Proof of Proposition 2.5: We first note that the partitions $(I_i,\ i = 1,\dots,p)$ defined in (2.4) and in (2.3) are the same. Take $\rho \in \Xi_r(\vec{l};\vec{\tau})$ and denote $\mu := \rho^{-1}$. We show that $\mu \in \Theta_r(\vec{l};\vec{\tau})$. It is clear that μ satisfies Rule 1. Take y, y' such that $y < y'$ and $\mu(y)$, $\mu(y') \in I_i$. We have

$$\rho(\mu(y)) = y < y' = \rho(\mu(y')).$$

So Rule 5 in the definition of $\Xi_r(\vec{\tau})$ implies that $\mu(y) < \mu(y')$. This shows that μ satisfies Rule 2. We conclude that μ belongs to the right-hand side of (2.5). We take ρ such that $\rho^{-1} =: \mu \in \Theta_r(\vec{l};\vec{\tau})$. Since

$$\rho(\tau_i) = \mu^{-1}(\tau_i) = l_i < l_j = \mu^{-1}(\tau_j) = \rho(\tau_j)$$

for $i < j$, ρ satisfies Rule 4. Take $y, y' \in I_i$ such that $y < y'$. From Rule 2, it is easy to see that

$$\mu^{-1}(y) < \mu^{-1}(y'),$$

that is, $\rho(y) < \rho(y')$. So ρ satisfies Rule 5. We conclude that $\rho \in \Xi_r(\vec{l};\vec{\tau})$. □

2.2 Multiple integrals

Let $g = (g^1,\dots,g^m)$ be a Hölder continuous function on $[0,T]$ of order $\beta > 1/2$ with values in $\mathbb{R}^m$. Take $\alpha = (\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_r) \in \Gamma_r$. Recall that we denote by Γ_r the collection of multi-indices of length r with elements in $\{1,\dots,m\}$. We also denote $\Gamma = \cup_{r=1}^{\infty}\Gamma_r$ the collection of all multi-indices with elements in $\{1,\dots,m\}$. Recall that $|\gamma|$ is the length of the multi-index γ. Given a permutation ρ on $\{1,\dots,r\}$, denote $\alpha \circ \rho = (\alpha_{\rho(1)},\dots,\alpha_{\rho(r)}) \in \Gamma_r$.

In this subsection, we study multiple integrals, defined as iterated Riemann-Stieltjes integrals, of the form

$$g^{\alpha}_{\tau,s} \ := \ \int_{\tau}^{s}\int_{\tau}^{s_r}\cdots\int_{\tau}^{s_2} dg^{\alpha_1}_{s_1}\cdots dg^{\alpha_{r-1}}_{s_{r-1}} dg^{\alpha_r}_{s_r}, \tag{2.6}$$

where $0 \le \tau \le s \le T$. We define the differential of $g^{\alpha}_{\tau,s}$ by

$$dg^{\alpha}_{\tau,s} = \left(\int_{\tau}^{s}\cdots\int_{\tau}^{s_2} dg^{\alpha_1}_{s_1}\cdots dg^{\alpha_{r-1}}_{s_{r-1}}\right) dg^{\alpha_r}_{s}. \tag{2.7}$$

The following lemma gives a formula for the product of two such multiple integrals.

Lemma 2.8 *Let γ', γ'' be multi-indices in Γ and denote $r' = |\gamma'|$, $r'' = |\gamma''|$ and $r = |\gamma'| + |\gamma''|$. Denote $\gamma = (\gamma', \gamma'') \in \Gamma$. Then*

$$g^{\gamma'}_{\tau,s} g^{\gamma''}_{\tau,s} = \sum_{\rho \in Sh(\gamma', \gamma'')} g^{\gamma \circ \rho^{-1}}_{\tau,s},$$

where $Sh(\gamma', \gamma'')$ is the collection of permutations ρ on $\{1, \ldots, r\}$ such that ρ does not change the orderings of $(1, \ldots, r')$ and the orderings of $(r'+1, \ldots, r)$, that is, if $y, y' \in \{1, \ldots, r'\}$ or $y, y' \in \{r'+1, \ldots, r\}$, and $y < y'$, then we have $\rho(y) < \rho(y')$.

This result can be shown by the properties of shuffle product of words (see, for example [16]) and Fubini's theorem.

The following is an immediate corollary of the above result.

Lemma 2.9 *Let γ', γ'', r', r and γ be as in Lemma 2.8. Then*

$$\int_\tau^s \int_\tau^{s''} dg^{\gamma'}_{\tau,s'} dg^{\gamma''}_{\tau,s''} = \int_\tau^s g^{\gamma'}_{\tau,s''} dg^{\gamma''}_{\tau,s''} = \sum_{\rho \in \Xi_r(r', r)} g^{\gamma \circ \rho^{-1}}_{\tau,s}. \tag{2.8}$$

Proof Using (2.7), we can rewrite the left-hand side of (2.8) as

$$\int_\tau^s g^{\gamma'}_{\tau,s''} g^{\gamma''-}_{\tau,s''} dg^{\gamma(r)}_{s''},$$

where we denote by $\gamma-$ the multi-index obtained by removing the last element of γ, that is, $\gamma- = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{r-1})$, and recall that $\gamma(i) = \gamma_i$ denotes the ith element of γ. Applying Lemma 2.8 to $g^{\gamma'}_{\tau,s''} g^{\gamma''-}_{\tau,s''}$ yields

$$\int_\tau^s \int_\tau^{s''} dg^{\gamma'}_{\tau,s'} dg^{\gamma''}_{\tau,s''} = \int_\tau^s \sum_{\rho \in Sh(\gamma', \gamma''-)} g^{(\gamma-) \circ \rho^{-1}}_{\tau,s''} dg^{\gamma(r)}_{s''}. \tag{2.9}$$

Denote by $\widetilde{\Xi}_r(r', r)$ the collection of permutations ρ on $\{1, \ldots, r\}$ such that there exists $\rho' \in Sh(\gamma', \gamma''-)$ such that

$$\rho(j) = \begin{cases} \rho'(j), & j = 1, \ldots, r-1, \\ r, & j = r. \end{cases}$$

Then (2.9) becomes

$$\sum_{\rho \in \widetilde{\Xi}_r(r', r)} g^{\gamma \circ \rho^{-1}}_{\tau,s}.$$

Equation (2.8) then follows by noticing that $\widetilde{\Xi}_r(r', r) = \Xi_r(r', r)$. □

The following result is a generalization of Lemma 2.9.

Proposition 2.10 *Let γ^1, …, γ^p be multi-indices in Γ, and denote $r = |\gamma^1| + \cdots + |\gamma^p|$ and $\tau_i = |\gamma^1| + \cdots + |\gamma^i|$, $i = 1, \ldots, p$. Denote $\gamma = (\gamma^1, \ldots, \gamma^p) \in \Gamma$. Then*

$$\int_\tau^s \int_\tau^{s_p} \cdots \int_\tau^{s_2} dg^{\gamma^1}_{\tau,s_1} \cdots dg^{\gamma^{p-1}}_{\tau,s_{p-1}} dg^{\gamma^p}_{\tau,s_p} = \sum_{\rho \in \Xi_r(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_p)} g^{\gamma \circ \rho^{-1}}_{\tau,s}. \tag{2.10}$$

Proof We prove the proposition by induction on p. The proposition is clearly true when $p = 1$, and by Lemma 2.9 it is true when $p = 2$. Take $p \geq 3$. Assuming that (2.10) holds for $p-1$, we can write

$$\int_\tau^s \int_\tau^{s_p} \cdots \int_\tau^{s_2} dg_{\tau,s_1}^{\gamma^1} \cdots dg_{\tau,s_{p-1}}^{\gamma^{p-1}} dg_{\tau,s_p}^{\gamma^p} = \sum_{\widetilde{\rho} \in \Xi_{\widetilde{r}}(\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_{p-1})} \int_\tau^s g_{\tau,s_p}^{\widetilde{\gamma} \circ \widetilde{\rho}^{-1}} dg_{\tau,s_p}^{\gamma^p}, \tag{2.11}$$

where $\widetilde{\gamma} = (\gamma^1, \ldots, \gamma^{p-1})$ and $\widetilde{r} = \tau_{p-1}$. Applying Lemma 2.9 to the right-hand side of (2.11) we have

$$\int_\tau^s \int_\tau^{s_p} \cdots \int_\tau^{s_2} dg_{\tau,s_1}^{\gamma^1} \cdots dg_{\tau,s_{p-1}}^{\gamma^{p-1}} dg_{\tau,s_p}^{\gamma^p} = \sum_{\widetilde{\rho} \in \Xi_{\widetilde{r}}(\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_{p-1})} \sum_{\widehat{\rho} \in \Xi_r(\tau_{p-1},\tau_p)} g_{\tau,s}^{(\widetilde{\gamma} \circ \widetilde{\rho}^{-1}, \gamma^p) \circ \widehat{\rho}^{-1}}. \tag{2.12}$$

For each $\widetilde{\rho} \in \Xi_{\widetilde{r}}(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_{p-1})$ and $\widehat{\rho} \in \Xi_r(\tau_{p-1}, \tau_p)$, we define a permutation $\rho = \rho_{\widetilde{\rho},\widehat{\rho}}$ on $\{1, \ldots, r\}$ such that

$$\rho(j) = \begin{cases} \widehat{\rho}(j), & j = \tau_{p-1}+1, \ldots, \tau_p, \\ \widehat{\rho}(\widetilde{\rho}(j)), & j = 1, \ldots, \tau_{p-1}. \end{cases}$$

Then (2.12) is equal to

$$\sum_{\widetilde{\rho} \in \Xi_{\widetilde{r}}(\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_{p-1})} \sum_{\widehat{\rho} \in \Xi_r(\tau_{p-1},\tau_p)} g_{\tau,s}^{\gamma \circ \rho_{\widetilde{\rho},\widehat{\rho}}^{-1}}. \tag{2.13}$$

We show that

$$\Xi_r(\vec{\tau}) = \left\{ \rho_{\widetilde{\rho},\widehat{\rho}} : \widetilde{\rho} \in \Xi_{\widetilde{r}}(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_{p-1}), \widehat{\rho} \in \Xi_r(\tau_{p-1}, \tau_p) \right\}. \tag{2.14}$$

It is easy to see that $\Xi_r(\vec{\tau})$ is included on the right-hand side of (2.14), that is, for each $\rho \in \Xi_r(\vec{\tau})$, we can find $\widetilde{\rho} \in \Xi_{\widetilde{r}}(\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_{p-1})$ and $\widehat{\rho} \in \Xi_r(\tau_{p-1}, \tau_p)$ such that $\rho = \rho_{\widetilde{\rho},\widehat{\rho}}$.

In the following, we show the other inclusion. We take $\rho = \rho_{\widetilde{\rho},\widehat{\rho}}$ from the right-hand side of (2.14). Rule 4 for $\widetilde{\rho}$ implies that $\widetilde{\rho}(\tau_i) < \widetilde{\rho}(\tau_j)$ for $i, j = 1, \ldots, p-1$ and $i < j$. This fact and Rule 5 for $\widehat{\rho}$ imply that

$$\rho(\tau_i) = (\widehat{\rho} \circ \widetilde{\rho})(\tau_i) < (\widehat{\rho} \circ \widetilde{\rho})(\tau_j) = \rho(\tau_j)$$

for $i, j = 1, \ldots, p-1$ and $i < j$. On the other hand, Rule 4 for $\widehat{\rho}$ implies that

$$\rho(\tau_{p-1}) = \widehat{\rho}(\widetilde{\rho}(\tau_{p-1})) = \widehat{\rho}(\tau_{p-1}) < \widehat{\rho}(\tau_p) = \rho(\tau_p).$$

Therefore, ρ satisfies Rule 4 in the definition of $\Xi_r(\vec{\tau})$. Take now $y < y'$ and $y, y' \in I_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, p-1$. By Rule 5 for $\widetilde{\rho}$, we have $\widetilde{\rho}(y) < \widetilde{\rho}(y')$, and thus $\rho(y) = \widehat{\rho}(\widetilde{\rho}(y)) < \widehat{\rho}(\widetilde{\rho}(y')) = \rho(y')$. On the other hand, if $y < y'$ and $y, y' \in I_p$, then by Rule 5 in the definition of $\widehat{\rho}$, we have $\rho(y) = \widehat{\rho}(y) < \widehat{\rho}(y') = \rho(y')$. We conclude that ρ satisfies Rule 5 in the definition of $\Xi_r(\vec{\tau})$. In summary, we have shown that $\rho \in \Xi_r(\vec{\tau})$. This proves identity (2.14).

It is easy to show that there is no duplicated element in the set on the right-hand side of (2.14), that is, whenever $\widetilde{\rho} \neq \widetilde{\rho}'$ or $\widehat{\rho} \neq \widehat{\rho}'$, we have $\rho_{\widetilde{\rho},\widehat{\rho}} \neq \rho_{\widetilde{\rho}',\widehat{\rho}'}$. This fact, together with identity (2.14), imply that (2.13) is equal to

$$\sum_{\rho \in \Xi_r(\tau_1,\ldots,\tau_p)} g_{\tau,s}^{\gamma \circ \rho^{-1}}.$$

This completes the proof. □

2.3 A generalized Leibniz rule

Using the permutation set $\Xi_r(\vec{\tau})$, we can state the following Leibniz rule. Recall that given a multi-index $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r)$ we denote $\alpha_{i,j} = (\alpha(i+1), \ldots, \alpha(j-1))$. We also use $\mathcal{V}_{j_1,\ldots,j_k} := \mathcal{V}_{j_1} \cdots \mathcal{V}_{j_k}$, where $\mathcal{V}_j$ is defined in (1.3).

Proposition 2.11 *Take $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r) \in \Gamma_r$, $\vec{l} = (l_1, \ldots, l_p)$ such that $1 \le l_1 < \cdots < l_p = r$, $p \le r$. Assume that $f_j^i \in C^{r-p}(\mathbb{R})$, $i = 1, \ldots, p$, $j = 1, \ldots, m$. Then the following Leibniz rule holds:*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{V}_{\alpha_{0,l_1}} \left(f^1_{\alpha_{l_1}} \cdots \mathcal{V}_{\alpha_{l_{p-2},l_{p-1}}} \left(f^{p-1}_{\alpha_{l_{p-1}}} \mathcal{V}_{\alpha_{l_{p-1},l_p}} f^p_{\alpha_{l_p}} \right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{1 \le \tau_1 < \cdots < \tau_p = r} \sum_{\rho \in \Xi_r(\vec{l};\vec{\tau})} \left(\mathcal{V}_{\alpha \circ \rho(0,\tau_1)} f^1_{\alpha \circ \rho(\tau_1)} \right) \cdots \left(\mathcal{V}_{\alpha \circ \rho(\tau_{p-1},\tau_p)} f^p_{\alpha \circ \rho(\tau_p)} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof The above formula follows from Lemma 2.3 and Proposition 2.5. □

3 The error function

The objective of this section is to derive an explicit expression for the remainder in the incomplete Taylor scheme (1.9). Let y be the solution of the differential equation

$$dy_t = V(y_t)dx_t, \quad y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{3.1}$$

on $[0,T]$, where $x : [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}^m$ is Hölder continuous of order $\beta > 1/2$ and $V = (V_j^i)_{1 \le i \le d, 1 \le j \le m}$ is a continuous mapping from $\mathbb{R}^d$ to $\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$. We consider the Taylor scheme

$$y_t^n = y_{t_k}^n + \mathcal{E}^{(N)}_{t_k,t}(y_{t_k}^n), \quad y_0^n = y_0, \tag{3.2}$$

for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$, $k = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$, where

$$\mathcal{E}^{(N)}_{s,t}(y) := \sum_{r=1}^{N} \sum_{\gamma \in \Gamma_r} \mathcal{V}_\gamma I(y) x^\gamma_{s,t}, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^d \tag{3.3}$$

is the order-N Taylor expansion and $\mathcal{V}_\gamma := \mathcal{V}_{\gamma(1)} \cdots \mathcal{V}_{\gamma(r)}$ for $\gamma = (\gamma(1), \ldots, \gamma(r)) \in \Gamma_r$ (the collection of multi-indices of length r with elements in $\{1, \ldots, m\}$). Recall that I is the identity function on $\mathbb{R}^d$, the vector field $\mathcal{V}_j$ is defined in (1.3) and for $\gamma \in \Gamma_r$ we denote (see (2.6))

$$x^\gamma_{s,t} := \int_s^t \cdots \int_s^{t_2} dx_{t_1}^{\gamma(1)} \cdots dx_{t_r}^{\gamma(r)}.$$

By (3.1) we can write

$$y_t - y_t^n = \int_0^t [V(y_s) - V(y_s^n)]\, dx_s + R_t, \tag{3.4}$$

where $R_t := \int_0^t V(y_s^n)dx_s - y_t^n$ is the remainder term. If we can find a function $\dot{V}_j(\xi, \xi')$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ (see (3.27)) such that

$$V_j(y_t) - V_j(y_t^n) = \dot{V}_j(y_t, y_t^n)(y_t - y_t^n),$$

$j = 1, \ldots, m$, then equation (3.4) can be considered as a linear differential equation for the error function $y - y^n$. Our aim in this section is to derive an explicit expression for the remainder $R_t = \int_0^t V(y_s^n)dx_s - y_t^n$.

3.1 A linear differential equation for the error function

We first consider the differential operator $\mathcal{V}_\gamma$ appearing in (3.3). We denote by Υ_p the collection of multi-indices of length p with elements in $\{1,\dots,d\}$ and $\Upsilon = \cup_{p=1}^\infty \Upsilon_p$. For $\zeta \in \Upsilon_p$, we denote

$$\partial_\zeta \;:=\; \partial_{\zeta_1}\partial_{\zeta_2}\cdots\partial_{\zeta_p}\,,$$

where ζ_j is the jth element of ζ and recall that $\partial_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial y^i}$. For $\alpha \in \Gamma_r$ such that $p \le r$, $\vec{\tau} = (\tau_1,\dots,\tau_p)$ such that $1 \le \tau_1 < \cdots < \tau_p = r$, and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we introduce the function

$$\begin{aligned} H(\alpha,\zeta,\vec{\tau})(y) &= \left(\mathcal{V}_{\alpha_{0,\tau_1}} V^{\zeta_1}_{\alpha_{\tau_1}}(y)\right)\dots\left(\mathcal{V}_{\alpha_{\tau_{p-1},\tau_p}} V^{\zeta_p}_{\alpha_{\tau_p}}(y)\right) \\ &= \left(\mathcal{V}_{\alpha_{0,\tau_1+1}} I_{\zeta_1}(y)\right)\dots\left(\mathcal{V}_{\alpha_{\tau_{p-1},\tau_p+1}} I_{\zeta_p}(y)\right), \end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

where $I_i(y) = y_i$, $i = 1,\dots,d$ is the projection function, and recall that given a multi-index $\alpha = (\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_r)$, we denote $\alpha_{i,j} = (\alpha_{i+1},\dots,\alpha_{j-1})$. Note that the second equation in (3.5) follows from the identity $\mathcal{V}_j I_i(y) = V^i_j(y)$.

Lemma 3.1 *Let $f \in C^r(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\alpha \in \Gamma_r$. Then the following identity holds true:*

$$\mathcal{V}_\alpha f \;=\; \sum_{p=1}^r \sum_{\zeta\in\Upsilon_p} \sum_{\substack{\vec{\tau}=(\tau_1,\dots,\tau_p):\\ 1\le\tau_1<\cdots<\tau_p=r}} \sum_{\rho\in\Xi_r(\vec{\tau})} H(\alpha\circ\rho,\zeta,\vec{\tau})\partial_\zeta f\,. \tag{3.6}$$

Proof It is easy to show by induction and by the definition of the vector field $\mathcal{V}_j$ that

$$\mathcal{V}_\alpha f \;=\; \sum_{p=1}^r \sum_{\zeta\in\Upsilon_p} \sum_{1\le l_1<\cdots<l_p=r} \mathcal{V}_{\alpha_{0,l_1}}\left(V^{\zeta_1}_{\alpha_{l_1}}\cdots\mathcal{V}_{\alpha_{l_{p-2},l_{p-1}}}\left(V^{\zeta_{p-1}}_{\alpha_{l_{p-1}}}\mathcal{V}_{\alpha_{l_{p-1},l_p}}V^{\zeta_p}_{\alpha_{l_p}}\right)\right)\partial_\zeta f.$$

Applying Proposition 2.11 to the above expression yields

$$\mathcal{V}_\alpha f \;=\; \sum_{p=1}^r \sum_{\zeta\in\Upsilon_p} \sum_{\substack{1\le l_1<\cdots<l_p=r\\ 1\le\tau_1<\cdots<\tau_p=r}} \sum_{\rho\in\Xi_r(\vec{l},\vec{\tau})} H(\alpha\circ\rho,\zeta,\vec{\tau})\partial_\zeta f\,.$$

Equation (3.6) is then obtained by noticing that the following two sets are identical:

$$\Xi_r(\vec{\tau}) \;=\; \bigcup_{\substack{\vec{l}=(l_1,\dots,l_p):\\ 1\le l_1<\cdots<l_p=r.}} \Xi_r(\vec{l},\vec{\tau}).$$

This completes the proof. □

Take $\zeta \in \Upsilon_p$. We denote by $\mathcal{E}^\zeta_{s,t}$ the multiple integral

$$\mathcal{E}^\zeta_{s,t} \;=\; \int_s^t\int_s^{t_r}\cdots\int_s^{t_2} d\mathcal{E}^{\zeta_1}_{s,t_1}\cdots d\mathcal{E}^{\zeta_{p-1}}_{s,t_{r-1}} d\mathcal{E}^{\zeta_p}_{s,t_r}, \tag{3.7}$$

where

$$\mathcal{E}^i_{s,t}(y) \;=\; \sum_{r=1}^N \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma_r} \mathcal{V}_\gamma I_i(y) x^\gamma_{s,t}\,, \quad y\in\mathbb{R}^d. \tag{3.8}$$

According to Proposition 2.10, the multiple integral $\mathcal{E}^\zeta_{s,t}$ can be expressed as a linear combination of elements in $\{x^\alpha_{s,t}\,, \alpha\in\Gamma\}$. Recall that $\Gamma = \cup_{r=1}^\infty \Gamma_r$ is the collection of multi-indices with elements in $\{1,\dots,m\}$. The following lemma provides an explicit formula for this linear combination. Recall that for a permutation ρ on $\{1,\dots,r\}$, we denote $\alpha\circ\rho = (\alpha_{\rho(1)},\dots,\alpha_{\rho(r)})$.

Lemma 3.2 *Take $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\zeta \in \Upsilon_p$. Assume that $V \in C^{N-1}$. Then for each $s,t \in [0,T]$ we have*

$$\mathcal{E}^{\zeta}_{s,t} = \sum_{r=p}^{N} \sum_{\substack{\vec{\tau}=(\tau_1,\dots,\tau_p):\\ 1\le\tau_1<\cdots<\tau_p=r}} \sum_{\alpha\in\Gamma_r} \sum_{\rho\in\Xi_r(\vec{\tau})} H(\alpha\circ\rho,\zeta,\vec{\tau})x^{\alpha}_{s,t} + Q(N,p,\zeta)_{s,t}, \tag{3.9}$$

where

$$Q(N,p,\zeta)_{s,t} = \sum_{\substack{\gamma^1,\dots,\gamma^p\in\Gamma:\\ |\gamma^1|+\cdots+|\gamma^p|>N\\ |\gamma^1|,\dots,|\gamma^p|\le N}} \sum_{\rho\in\Xi_{|\gamma|}(\vec{\tau}(\gamma))} H(\gamma,\zeta,\vec{\tau}(\gamma))x^{\gamma\circ\rho^{-1}}_{s,t},$$

$\gamma = (\gamma^1,\dots,\gamma^p)$, $\vec{\tau}(\gamma) = (\tau_1(\gamma),\dots,\tau_p(\gamma))$ and $\tau_i(\gamma) = |\gamma^1|+\cdots+|\gamma^i|$, $i = 1,\dots,p$.

Proof It follows from (3.7) and (3.8) that

$$\mathcal{E}^{\zeta}_{s,t}(y) = \sum_{\substack{\gamma^1,\dots,\gamma^p\in\Gamma:\\ 1\le|\gamma^1|,\dots,|\gamma^p|\le N}} \mathcal{V}_{\gamma^1}I_{\zeta_1}(y)\cdots\mathcal{V}_{\gamma^p}I_{\zeta_p}(y)\int_s^t\int_s^{t_p}\cdots\int_s^{t_2} dx^{\gamma^1}_{t_1}\cdots dx^{\gamma^{p-1}}_{t_{p-1}}dx^{\gamma^p}_{t_p}.$$

We recall the notation $\gamma = (\gamma^1,\dots,\gamma^p)$, and $\tau_i(\gamma) = |\gamma^1|+\cdots+|\gamma^i|$, $i = 1,\dots,p$. It follows from Proposition 2.10 and the definition of the function H in (3.5) that

$$\mathcal{E}^{\zeta}_{s,t}(y) = \sum_{\substack{\gamma^1,\dots,\gamma^p\in\Gamma:\\ 1\le|\gamma^1|,\dots,|\gamma^p|\le N}} H\left(\gamma,\zeta,\vec{\tau}(\gamma)\right)(y) \sum_{\rho\in\Xi_{|\gamma|}(\vec{\tau}(\gamma))} x^{\gamma\circ\rho^{-1}}_{s,t},$$

or

$$\mathcal{E}^{\zeta}_{s,t}(y) = \left(\sum_{r=p}^{N}\sum_{|\gamma^1|+\cdots+|\gamma^p|=r} + \sum_{\substack{|\gamma^1|+\cdots+|\gamma^p|>N\\ |\gamma^1|,\dots,|\gamma^p|\le N}}\right) \sum_{\rho\in\Xi_{|\gamma|}(\vec{\tau}(\gamma))} H(\gamma,\zeta,\vec{\tau}(\gamma))(y)x^{\gamma\circ\rho^{-1}}_{s,t}. \tag{3.10}$$

The second term in the above summation is exactly $Q(N,p,\zeta)_{s,t}(y)$. On the other hand, since

$$\{(\gamma^1,\dots,\gamma^p) : \sum_{i=1}^{p}|\gamma^i| = r\} = \bigcup_{\substack{\tau_1,\dots,\tau_p:\\ 1\le\tau_1<\cdots<\tau_p=r}} \{(\gamma^1,\dots,\gamma^p) : |\gamma^i| = \tau_i-\tau_{i-1}, i = 1,\dots,p\},$$

where $\tau_0 = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{|\gamma^1|+\cdots+|\gamma^p|=r}\sum_{\rho\in\Xi_r(\vec{\tau}(\gamma))} H(\gamma,\zeta,\vec{\tau}(\gamma))x^{\gamma\circ\rho^{-1}}_{s,t}\\ &= \sum_{\substack{\vec{\tau}=(\tau_1,\dots,\tau_p):\\ 1\le\tau_1<\cdots<\tau_p=r}} \sum_{\substack{\gamma^i:|\gamma^i|=\tau_i-\tau_{i-1}\\ i=1,\dots,p}} \sum_{\rho\in\Xi_r(\vec{\tau})} H(\gamma,\zeta,\vec{\tau})x^{\gamma\circ\rho^{-1}}_{s,t}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Notice that for fixed $\vec{\tau} = (\tau_1,\dots,\tau_p)$ such that $1 \le \tau_1 < \cdots < \tau_p = r$ and $\rho \in \Xi_r(\vec{\tau})$, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\gamma^i:|\gamma^i|=\tau_i-\tau_{i-1}\\ i=1,\dots,p}} H(\gamma,\zeta,\vec{\tau})x^{\gamma\circ\rho^{-1}}_{s,t} = \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma_r} H(\gamma,\zeta,\vec{\tau})x^{\gamma\circ\rho^{-1}}_{s,t},$$

so the quantity in (3.11) is equal to

$$\sum_{\substack{\tau_1,\dots,\tau_p:\\ 1\le\tau_1<\cdots<\tau_p=r}} \sum_{\rho\in\Xi_r(\vec{\tau})} \sum_{\gamma:|\gamma|=r} H(\gamma,\zeta,\vec{\tau}) x_{s,t}^{\gamma\circ\rho^{-1}}.$$

Since ρ is a bijection on $\{1,\dots,r\}$, by replacing $\gamma\circ\rho^{-1}$ by α, the above expression becomes

$$\sum_{\substack{\tau_1,\dots,\tau_p:\\ 1\le\tau_1<\cdots<\tau_p=r}} \sum_{\rho\in\Xi_r(\vec{\tau})} \sum_{\alpha\circ\rho:|\alpha|=r} H(\alpha\circ\rho,\zeta,\vec{\tau}) x_{s,t}^{\alpha}.$$

Substituting the above expression into (3.10), we obtain identity (3.9). □

Let $f\in C^N(\mathbb{R})$ and $s,t\in[0.T]$. It follows from (3.6) in Lemma 3.1 that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{r=1}^{N}\sum_{\alpha\in\Gamma_r} x_{s,t}^{\alpha}\mathcal{V}_\alpha f &= \sum_{r=1}^{N}\sum_{\alpha\in\Gamma_r} x_{s,t}^{\alpha}\sum_{p=1}^{r}\sum_{\zeta\in\Upsilon_p}\sum_{1\le\tau_1<\cdots<\tau_p=r}\sum_{\rho\in\Xi_r(\vec{\tau})} H(\alpha\circ\rho,\zeta,\vec{\tau})\partial_\zeta f\\ &= \sum_{1\le p\le r\le N}\sum_{\zeta\in\Upsilon_p}\sum_{\alpha\in\Gamma_r}\sum_{1\le\tau_1<\cdots<\tau_p=r}\sum_{\rho\in\Xi_r(\vec{\tau})} x_{s,t}^{\alpha} H(\alpha\circ\rho,\zeta,\vec{\tau})\partial_\zeta f. \quad (3.12)\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, it follows from (3.9) in Lemma 3.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{p=1}^{N}\sum_{\zeta\in\Upsilon_p}\left(\mathcal{E}_{s,t}^{\zeta}-Q(N,|\zeta|,\zeta)_{s,t}\right)\partial_\zeta f\\ &=\sum_{p=1}^{N}\sum_{\zeta\in\Upsilon_p}\partial_\zeta f\sum_{r=p}^{N}\sum_{\substack{\tau_1,\dots,\tau_p:\\ 1\le\tau_1<\cdots<\tau_p=r}}\sum_{\alpha\in\Gamma_r}\sum_{\rho\in\Xi_r(\vec{\tau})} H(\alpha\circ\rho,\zeta,\vec{\tau})x_{s,t}^{\alpha},\end{aligned}$$

which is equal to the right-hand side of (3.12). Therefore, we obtain the following identity

$$\sum_{\alpha\in\Gamma:1\le|\alpha|\le N} x_{s,t}^{\alpha}\mathcal{V}_\alpha f = \sum_{\zeta\in\Upsilon:1\le|\zeta|\le N}\mathcal{E}_{s,t}^{\zeta}\partial_\zeta f - \sum_{\zeta\in\Upsilon:1\le|\zeta|\le N} Q(N,|\zeta|,\zeta)_{s,t}\partial_\zeta f. \quad (3.13)$$

Notice that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{E}_{s,t}^{(N)}(y) &= \sum_{j=1}^{m}\int_s^t \sum_{\alpha\in\Gamma:0\le|\alpha|\le N-1} x_{s,u}^{\alpha}\mathcal{V}_\alpha V_j(y)dx_u^j\\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{m}\int_s^t\left(V_j(y)+\sum_{\alpha\in\Gamma:1\le|\alpha|\le N-1} x_{s,u}^{\alpha}\mathcal{V}_\alpha V_j(y)\right)dx_u^j. \quad (3.14)\end{aligned}$$

Then, applying (3.13) to the second term on the right-hand side of (3.14) with $f=V_j$, we obtain the following result.

Proposition 3.3 *Let $\mathcal{E}_{s,t}^{(N)}$ be the order-N Taylor expansion defined in (3.3). Assume that $V\in C^N$. Then the following equation holds true,*

$$\int_s^t\left(V(y)+\sum_{\zeta\in\Upsilon:1\le|\zeta|\le N}\mathcal{E}_{s,u}^{\zeta}(y)\partial_\zeta V(y)\right)dx_u - \mathcal{E}_{s,t}^{(N)}(y) = R_{s,t}^{1}(y), \quad (3.15)$$

where

$$R^1_{s,t}(y) = \sum_{\zeta\in\Upsilon_N}\int_s^t \mathcal{E}^\zeta_{s,u}(y)\partial_\zeta V(y)dx_u + \sum_{\zeta\in\Upsilon:1\le|\zeta|\le N-1}\int_s^t Q(N-1,|\zeta|,\zeta)_{s,u}(y)\partial_\zeta V(y)dx_u\,. \tag{3.16}$$

Applying the chain rule repeatedly we obtain

$$V(y+\mathcal{E}^{(N)}_{s,t}(y)) = V(y) + \sum_{\zeta\in\Upsilon:1\le|\zeta|\le N}\mathcal{E}^\zeta_{s,t}(y)\partial_\zeta V(y) + \sum_{\zeta\in\Upsilon_{N+1}}\mathcal{E}^\zeta_{s,t}\left(\partial_\zeta V(y+\mathcal{E}^{(N)}_{s,\cdot}(y))\right)(y), \tag{3.17}$$

where for $\zeta\in\Upsilon_p$, we denote

$$\mathcal{E}^\zeta_{s,t}(f) = \int_s^t\int_s^{t_r}\cdots\int_s^{t_2} f_{t_1}d\mathcal{E}^{\zeta_1}_{s,t_1}\cdots d\mathcal{E}^{\zeta_{p-1}}_{s,t_{r-1}}d\mathcal{E}^{\zeta_p}_{s,t_r}. \tag{3.18}$$

Note that the first two terms on the right-hand side of (3.17) are the integrands of (3.15), so Proposition 3.3 implies

$$\int_s^t V\left(y+\mathcal{E}^{(N)}_{s,u}(y)\right)dx_u - \mathcal{E}^{(N)}_{s,t}(y) = \sum_{\zeta\in\Upsilon_{N+1}}\int_s^t \mathcal{E}^\zeta_{s,u}\left(\partial_\zeta V\left(y+\mathcal{E}^{(N)}_{s,\cdot}(y)\right)\right)(y)dx_u + R^1_{s,t}(y).$$

In particular, the difference $\int_s^t V\left(y+\mathcal{E}^{(N)}_{s,u}(y)\right)dx_u - \mathcal{E}^{(N)}_{s,t}(y)$ is equal to the summation of multiple integrals of order higher than N. Our next result is a generalization of this property. We first introduce a modification of the order-N Taylor expansion.

Definition 3.4 *Let $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ be a finite subset of Γ (collection of multi-indices with elements in $\{1,\dots,m\}$) and denote $N=\max\left\{|\alpha|\,,\alpha\in\widetilde{\Gamma}\right\}$. We define the* incomplete Taylor expansion

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(N)}_{s,t}(y) = \sum_{\gamma\in\widetilde{\Gamma}}\mathcal{V}_\gamma I(y)x^\gamma_{s,t}. \tag{3.19}$$

If $\mathcal{E}^{(N)}_{s,t}(y)$ is defined as in (3.3) and if $\widetilde{\Gamma}=\{\gamma\in\Gamma:|\gamma|\le N\}$ we have $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(N)}_{s,t}=\mathcal{E}^{(N)}_{s,t}$. In the following, $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^\zeta_{s,t}(f)$ is the multiple integral defined as in (3.18) by replacing $\mathcal{E}^{\zeta_j}_{s,t}$ by $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^{\zeta_j}_{s,t}$ in (3.18).

Proposition 3.5 *Let $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(N)}_{s,t}$ and $\mathcal{E}^{(N)}_{s,t}$, $t\in[0,T]$ be the incomplete Taylor expansion and the order-N Taylor expansion in Definition 3.4 with $N=\max_{\gamma\in\widetilde{\Gamma}}|\gamma|$. Assume that $V\in C^{N+1}$. Then the following equation holds true,*

$$\int_s^t V(y+\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(N)}_{s,u}(y))dx_u - \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(N)}_{s,t}(y) = \sum_{e=1}^4 R^e_{s,t}(y), \tag{3.20}$$

where $R^1_{s,t}(y)$ is the same as in (3.16), and

$$R^2_{s,t}(y) = \sum_{\zeta\in\Upsilon_{N+1}}\int_s^t \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^\zeta_{s,u}\left(\partial_\zeta V(y+\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(N)}_{s,\cdot}(y))\right)(y)dx_u, \tag{3.21}$$

$$R^3_{s,t}(y) = \sum_{\zeta\in\Upsilon:1\le|\zeta|\le N}\int_s^t \left(\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^\zeta_{s,u}(y)-\mathcal{E}^\zeta_{s,u}(y)\right)\partial_\zeta V(y)dx_u, \tag{3.22}$$

$$R^4_{s,t}(y) = \mathcal{E}^{(N)}_{s,t}(y)-\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(N)}_{s,t}(y)\,. \tag{3.23}$$

Proof As in (3.17), applying the chain rule several times we obtain

$$V(y+\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{s,t}^{(N)}(y)) = V(y) + \sum_{\zeta\in\Upsilon:1\le|\zeta|\le N} \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{s,t}^{\zeta}(y)\partial_\zeta V(y) + \sum_{\zeta\in\Upsilon:|\zeta|=N+1} \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{s,t}^{\zeta}\left(\partial_\zeta V(y+\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{s,\cdot}^{(N)}(y))\right)(y). \tag{3.24}$$

Integrating both sides of the above equation with respect to dx_u over $[s,t]$ and then subtracting $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{s,t}^{(N)}(y)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_s^t V(y+\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{s,u}^{(N)}(y))dx_u - \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{s,t}^{(N)}(y)\\ &= \int_s^t V(y)dx + \int_s^t \left(\sum_{\zeta\in\Upsilon:1\le|\zeta|\le N} \mathcal{E}_{s,u}^{\zeta}\partial_\zeta V(y)\right) dx_u - \mathcal{E}_{s,t}^{(N)}(y) + \sum_{e=2}^{4} R_{s,t}^{e}(y).\end{aligned}$$

Applying Proposition 3.3 to the above equation we obtain equation (3.20). □

Definition 3.6 *Take $\alpha,\alpha'\in\Gamma$ such that $|\alpha|=r$ and $|\alpha'|=r+1$. We say that α is contained in α', denoted by $\alpha \Subset \alpha'$, if there is an injection ρ from $\{1,\dots,r\}$ to $\{1,\dots,r+1\}$ such that $\alpha(i)=\alpha'(\rho(i))$, $i=1,\dots,r$.*

Definition 3.7 *We say that $\widetilde{\Gamma}\subset\Gamma$ has a hierarchical structure if for any $\alpha\in\Gamma\setminus\widetilde{\Gamma}$ and $\alpha\Subset\alpha'$, we have $\alpha'\in\Gamma\setminus\widetilde{\Gamma}$.*

The following result shows that the difference $\int_s^t V(y+\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{s,u}^{(N)}(y))dx_u - \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{s,t}^{(N)}(y)$ is equal to the summation of multiple integrals of order "higher" than those in $\{x^\alpha:\alpha\in\widetilde{\Gamma}\}$.

Proposition 3.8 *Let the assumptions be as in Proposition 3.5. Then the following statements hold true:*
(i) *$R_{s,t}^1(y)$ is a linear combination of the multiple integrals in $\left\{x_{s,t}^\alpha:\alpha\in\Gamma,\,|\alpha|\ge N+1\right\}$, and the coefficients of this combination are the products of $\mathcal{V}_\gamma I_i(y)$ and $\partial_\zeta V_j(y)$ for $\gamma\in\Gamma$ such that $|\gamma|\le N$ and $\zeta\in\Upsilon$ such that $|\zeta|\le N$, $i=1,\dots,d$, $j=1,\dots,m$.*
(ii) *$R_{s,t}^4(y)$ is a linear combination of the multiple integrals in $\left\{x_{s,t}^\alpha:\alpha\in\Gamma\setminus\widetilde{\Gamma}\right\}$, and the coefficients are $\mathcal{V}_\gamma I(y)$ for $\gamma\in\Gamma\setminus\widetilde{\Gamma}$ such that $|\gamma|\le N$.*
(iii) *Assume that $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ has the hierarchical structure introduced in Definition 3.7. Then $R_{s,t}^3(y)$ is a linear combination of the multiple integrals in $\left\{x_{s,t}^\alpha:\alpha\in\Gamma\setminus\widetilde{\Gamma}\right\}$, and the coefficients are products of $\mathcal{V}_\gamma I_i(y)$ and $\partial_\zeta V_j(y)$ for $\gamma\in\Gamma$ such that $|\gamma|\le N$ and $\zeta\in\Upsilon$ such that $|\zeta|\le N$, $i=1,\dots,d$, $j=1,\dots,m$.*

With the help of Proposition 3.5 we can now derive an equation for the global error function of the incomplete Taylor scheme (1.9) associated with the incomplete Taylor expansion $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{s,t}^{(N)}(y)$ in (1.8) or (3.19); that is, for the global error function of the numerical scheme

$$y_t^n \;=\; y_{t_k}^n + \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{t_k,t}^{(N)}(y_{t_k}^n),\quad t\in[t_k,t_{k+1}],\quad k=0,1,\dots,n-1. \tag{3.25}$$

Recall that $t_k=kT/n$, $k=0,1,\dots,n-1$, $\lfloor a\rfloor$ is the integer part of a and $a\wedge b$ is the small of a and b for $a,b\in\mathbb{R}$.

Proposition 3.9 *Let y and y^n be the solutions of equation (3.1) and (3.25), respectively. Let $R^e_{s,t}(y)$, $e = 1, 2, 3, 4$, be the functions defined in (3.16), (3.21), (3.22) and (3.23). Assume that $V \in C^{N+1}$. Then the error function $y - y^n$ satisfies the equation*

$$y_t - y^n_t = \int_0^t (V(y_s) - V(y^n_s))\, dx_s + \sum_{e=1}^{4} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{nt}{T} \rfloor} R^e_{t_k, t_{k+1}\wedge t}(y^n_{t_k}), \tag{3.26}$$

for $t \in [0, T]$.

Remark 3.10 *Denote $\epsilon := y - y^n$, and set*

$$\dot{V}_j(\xi, \xi') := \int_0^1 \partial V_j(\theta\xi + (1-\theta)\xi')d\theta, \tag{3.27}$$

for $\xi, \xi' \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $j = 1, \ldots, m$. The following linear differential equation for ϵ can be easily derived from (3.26),

$$\epsilon_t = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \int_0^t \dot{V}_j(y_u, y^n_u)\epsilon_u dx^j_u + \sum_{e=1}^{4} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{nt}{T} \rfloor} R^e_{t_k, t_{k+1}\wedge t}(y^n_{t_k})\,. \tag{3.28}$$

Proof of Proposition 3.9: By taking $s = t_k$, $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$ and $y = y^n_{t_k}$ in (3.20) we obtain

$$\int_{t_k}^t V(y^n_u)dx_u - \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(N)}_{t_k,t}(y^n_{t_k}) = \sum_{e=1}^{4} R^e_{t_k,t}(y^n_{t_k})\,.$$

This implies that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}\wedge t} V(y^n_u)dx_u - \sum_{i=0}^{k} \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(N)}_{t_i, t_{i+1}\wedge t}(y^n_{t_i}) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \sum_{e=1}^{4} R^e_{t_i, t_{i+1}\wedge t}(y^n_{t_i}), \quad t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}],$$

or

$$\int_0^t V(y^n_u)dx_u - y^n_t = \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{nt}{T} \rfloor} \sum_{e=1}^{4} R^e_{t_i, t_{i+1}\wedge t}(y^n_{t_i}).$$

Equation (3.26) then follows by noticing equation (3.4). □

3.2 The explicit expression for the error function

In this subsection we derive an explicit expression of the error function $y - y^n$, where y and y^n are solutions of equation (3.1) and (3.25), respectively, with $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(N)}_{s,t}(y)$ being the incomplete Taylor expansion (3.19).

We define the *fundamental equation* of (3.28),

$$\Phi_t = I + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \int_0^t \dot{V}_j(y_s, y^n_s)\Phi_s dx^j_s\,, \tag{3.29}$$

and its inverse,

$$\Psi_t = I - \sum_{j=1}^{m} \int_0^t \Psi_s \dot{V}_j(y_s, y^n_s)dx^j_s\,, \tag{3.30}$$

for $t \in [0,T]$. Recall that $\dot{V}$ is defined in (3.27) and I is the $d \times d$ identity matrix. The fact that Ψ is the inverse of the function Φ, i.e. $\Psi\Phi \equiv I$, can be shown by applying the product rule to $\Psi\Phi$ and taking into account the identity

$$\int_0^t \Psi_s \cdot d\Phi_s + \int_0^t d\Psi_s \cdot \Phi_s = 0.$$

The following result provides an explicit expression for the error function $y - y^n$ under the above assumptions. We denote $\eta(t) = t_k$ for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$.

Theorem 3.11 *Let assumptions be as in Proposition 3.9. The following expression of $y - y^n$ holds true for $t \in [0,T]$,*

$$\begin{aligned} y_t - y_t^n &= \sum_{e=1}^{4} \Phi_t \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{nt}{T} \rfloor} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}\wedge t} \Psi_s dR^e_{t_k,s}(y^n_{t_k}) \qquad (3.31) \\ &= \sum_{e=1}^{4} \Phi_t \int_0^t \Psi_s dR^e_{\eta(s),s}(y^n_{\eta(s)}) \,. \end{aligned}$$

Proof By applying the product rule to the quantity on the right-hand side of equation (3.31) and taking into account identities (3.29) and $\Phi\Psi \equiv I$, we can show that this quantity satisfies equation (3.28), and by the uniqueness of the solution of equation (3.28), we conclude that it is equal to $y_t - y_t^n$. □

4 The incomplete Taylor scheme

Let y be the solution of the differential equation (3.1) and let x^j be Hölder continuous of order $\beta_j > 1/2$. Given any finite set $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ of Γ (collection of multi-indices with elements in $\{1,\dots,m\}$) let y^n be the approximation solution defined by (3.25), where $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(N)}_{s,t}(y)$ is the incomplete Taylor expansion in Definition 3.4. In this section, we study the convergence rate of y^n to y. Denote $\beta := \min_j \beta_j$.

Let $a, b \in [0,T]$ with $a < b$ and $\delta \in (0,1)$. For a function $z : [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$, $\|z\|_{a,b,\delta}$ denotes the δ-Hölder seminorm of z on $[a,b]$, that is,

$$\|z\|_{a,b,\delta} = \sup\left\{ \frac{|z_u - z_v|}{(v-u)^\delta} : \, a \le u < v \le b \right\}.$$

We will denote the uniform norm of z on the interval $[a,b]$ by $\|z\|_{a,b,\infty}$. When $a = 0$ and $b = T$, we will simply write $\|z\|_\infty$ for $\|z\|_{0,T,\infty}$ and $\|z\|_\delta$ for $\|z\|_{0,T,\delta}$.

The following lemma provides some upper bounds of y^n, Φ and Ψ.

Lemma 4.1 *Let $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ be a finite subset of Γ and assume $V \in C_b^{N+1}$. Let y^n be the solution of (3.25). We have the following estimate*

$$\|y^n\|_\beta \le C\|x\|_\beta \vee \|x\|_\beta^{1/\beta + N - 1}, \qquad (4.1)$$

where C is a constant independent of n. Furthermore, the following estimate holds true for the functions Φ and Ψ defined in (3.29) and (3.30),

$$\|\Phi\|_\beta \vee \|\Phi\|_\infty \vee \|\Psi\|_\beta \vee \|\Psi\|_\infty \le C \exp(C\|x\|_\beta^{1/\beta^2 + (N-1)/\beta}).$$

Proof The upper bound estimate for y^n follows immediately from Lemma 8.4. We turn to the function Φ. Consider the following system of equations

$$\begin{aligned} y^n_t &= y_0 + \int_0^t dy^n_s\,, \\ y_t &= y_0 + \int_0^t V(y_s)dx_s\,, \\ \Phi_t &= I + \sum_{j=1}^m \int_0^t \dot{V}_j(y_u, y^n_u)\Phi_u dx^j_u\,. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 3.1 in [7] to the above system we obtain

$$\|\Phi\|_\beta \leq C\exp(C\|y^n\|^{1/\beta}_\beta + C\|x\|^{1/\beta}_\beta).$$

Applying the estimate (4.1) to the right-hand side of the above inequality, we obtain the upper bound for $\|\Phi\|_\beta$. The upper bound for $\|\Phi\|_\infty$ follows from the estimate of $\|\Phi\|_\beta$. The upper bounds for Ψ can be shown similarly. □

We also need the following upper bound on $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(N)}_{s,\cdot}(y)$.

Lemma 4.2 *Take $s, s' \in [0,T]$ such that $s < s'$ and $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Assume that $V \in C^{N-1}_b$. Then for the incomplete Taylor expansion $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(N)}_{s,t}(y)$, $t \in [s,s']$ we have*

$$\|\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(N)}_{s,\cdot}(y)\|_{s,s',\beta} \leq K\exp\left(K\sum_{j=1}^m \|x^j\|_{s,s',\beta_j}\right),$$

for some constant C independent of n.

Proof By Lemma 8.1, we have, for any $\alpha \in \Gamma_r$

$$\|x^\alpha_{s,\cdot}\|_{s,s',\beta} \leq \prod_{i=1}^r \|x^{\alpha_i}\|_{s,s',\beta_{\alpha_i}} \leq \exp\left(K\sum_{j=1}^m \|x^j\|_{s,s',\beta_j}\right).$$

The desired estimate follows immediately by noticing that $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(N)}_{s,t}(y)$ is a linear combination of multiple integrals in $\{x^\alpha_{s,t} : \alpha \in \widetilde{\Gamma}\}$. □

For a given finite subset $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ of Γ, we define

$$\theta = \theta_{\widetilde{\Gamma}} := \min\left\{\beta_{\alpha(1)} + \cdots + \beta_{\alpha(|\alpha|)} - 1 \,:\, \alpha \in \Gamma \setminus \widetilde{\Gamma}\right\}. \tag{4.2}$$

Lemma 4.3 *Assume that α belongs to $\Gamma \setminus \widetilde{\Gamma}$. Assume that f is a Hölder continuous function of order β. Then there exists a constant K such that for $t, t' \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$, $k = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$, we have*

$$\left|\int_t^{t'} f_u dx^\alpha_{t_k,u}\right| \leq K(\|f\|_\beta + \|f\|_\infty)\exp\left(K\sum_{j=1}^m \|x^j\|_{\beta_j}\right) n^{-\theta-1}.$$

Proof Take $\alpha \in \Gamma$ such that $|\alpha| = r$. Applying Lemma 8.2 to the integral $\int_t^{t'} f_u dx^\alpha_{t_k,u}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left|\int_t^{t'} f_u dx^\alpha_{t_k,u}\right| &\leq K(\|f\|_\beta + \|f\|_\infty)\left(\prod_{j=1}^r \|x^{\alpha_j}\|_{\beta_{\alpha_j}}\right) n^{-\sum_{j=1}^r \beta_{\alpha_j}} \\ &\leq K(\|f\|_\beta + \|f\|_\infty)\exp\left(K\sum_{j=1}^m \|x^j\|_{\beta_j}\right) n^{-\sum_{j=1}^r \beta_{\alpha_j}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\alpha \notin \widetilde{\Gamma}$, we see that $\sum_{j=1}^{r} \beta_{\alpha_j} \geq \theta + 1$, proving the desired estimate. □

In the following, we consider the incomplete Taylor scheme (3.25) defined by any finite set $\widetilde{\Gamma}$.

Lemma 4.4 *Assume that $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ has the hierarchical structure introduced in Definition 3.7. Assume that f is a Hölder continuous function of order β, and $R^e_{s,t}(y)$, $e = 1, 2, 3, 4$, are the functions defined by (3.16), (3.21), (3.22) and (3.23). Assume that $V \in C_b^{N+1}$. Then there exists a constant K such that for $t, t' \in [t_k, t_{k+1}] \subset [0, T]$, we have*

$$\left| \int_t^{t'} f_u dR^2_{t_k,u}(y) \right| \leq C \left(\|f\|_\beta + \|f\|_\infty \right) \exp\left(K \sum_{j=1}^{m} \|x^j\|_{\beta_j} \right) n^{-(N+2)\beta}, \tag{4.3}$$

and

$$\left| \int_t^{t'} f_u dR^e_{t_k,u}(y) \right| \leq C \left(\|f\|_\beta + \|f\|_\infty \right) \exp\left(K \sum_{j=1}^{m} \|x^j\|_{\beta_j} \right) n^{-\theta-1}, \quad e = 1, 2, 3, 4. \tag{4.4}$$

Proof According to Proposition 3.8, for $e = 1, 3, 4$, the integral $\int_t^{t'} f_u dR^e_{t_k,u}(y)$ is a linear combination of integrals of the form

$$\int_t^{t'} f_u dx^\alpha_{t_k,u}, \quad \alpha \in \Gamma \setminus \widetilde{\Gamma}.$$

So inequality (4.4) for $e = 1, 3, 4$ follows from Lemma 4.3.

Inequality (4.3) can be shown by applying Lemma 8.2 to the integral

$$\int_t^{t'} f_u dR^2_{t_k,u}(y) = \sum_{\zeta \in \Upsilon : |\zeta| = N+1} \int_t^{t'} \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^\zeta_{s,u} \left(\partial_\zeta V(y + \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(N)}_{s,\cdot}(y)) \right)(y) f_u dx_u$$

and taking into account the estimates in Lemma 4.2. Finally, inequality (4.4) holds for $e = 2$ because it is easy to verify from the definition of θ that $(N+1)\beta \geq \theta + 1$. □

The following theorem is the main result in this section.

Theorem 4.5 *Let $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ be a finite subset of Γ and let θ be defined by (4.2). Assume that $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ has the hierarchical structure introduced in Definition 3.7. Let y be the solution of equation (3.1) and let y^n be the solution to (3.25). Assume that $V \in C_b^{N+1}$. Then*

$$\sup_{t \in [0,T]} |y_t - y^n_t| \leq G n^{-\theta},$$

where

$$G = C \exp\left(C \|x\|_\beta^{1/\beta^2 + (N-1)/\beta} + C \sum_{j=1}^{m} \|x^j\|_{\beta_j} \right).$$

Proof Because of identity (3.31) and the estimate of $\|\Phi\|_\infty$ in Lemma 4.1, we only need to show that the quantity

$$\sum_{e=1}^{4} \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{nt}{T} \rfloor} \left| \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1} \wedge t} \Psi_s dR^e_{t_k,s}(y^n_{t_k}) \right|$$

is bounded by $Gn^{-\theta}$ for $t \in [0,T]$. Inequality (4.4) in Lemma 4.4 shows that the above quantity is bounded by

$$C \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{nt}{T} \rfloor} (\|\Psi\|_\beta + \|\Psi\|_\infty) \exp\left(K \sum_{j=1}^m \|x^j\|_{\beta_j} \right) n^{-\theta-1},$$

which is less than

$$C (\|\Psi\|_\beta + \|\Psi\|_\infty) \exp\left(K \sum_{j=1}^m \|x^j\|_{\beta_j} \right) n^{-\theta}.$$

Applying the estimates on Ψ given in Lemma 4.1 to the above expression, we obtain the desired estimate. □

Now we can apply this theorem to obtain the best Taylor scheme. It is clear that the possible rates of convergence are of the form $n^{-\theta}$, where θ is a nonnegative integer linear combination of β_i, $i = 1, \ldots, m$ subtracting one:

$$\theta = \sum_{j=1}^m k_j \beta_j - 1, \ k_j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \text{ and } j = 1, \ldots, m\,. \tag{4.5}$$

Given a rate of the above form we define

$$\Gamma(\theta) := \{\alpha \in \Gamma : \beta_{\alpha(1)} + \cdots + \beta_{\alpha(|\alpha|)} - 1 < \theta\}. \tag{4.6}$$

Lemma 4.6 *If θ has the form (4.5), then $\theta_{\Gamma(\theta)} = \theta$, where $\theta_{\Gamma(\theta)}$ is defined by (4.2).*

Proof Let $\theta = \sum_{j=1}^m k_j \beta_j - 1$ for some k_j, $j = 1, \cdots, m$. Consider

$$\alpha = (\overbrace{1, \ldots, 1}^{k_1}, \ldots, \overbrace{m, \ldots, m}^{k_m})\,.$$

Then $\beta_{\alpha(1)} + \cdots + \beta_{\alpha(|\alpha|)} - 1 = \theta$ and hence $\alpha \notin \Gamma(\theta)$. This shows that $\theta_{\Gamma(\theta)} \le \theta$. If $\theta_{\Gamma(\theta)} < \theta$, then, by the definition of $\theta_{\Gamma(\theta)}$, there is an $\alpha = (\alpha(1), \ldots, \alpha(r)) \in \Gamma \backslash \Gamma(\theta)$ such that $\beta_{\alpha(1)} + \cdots + \beta_{\alpha(|\alpha|)} - 1 < \theta$. On the other hand, by our definition of $\Gamma(\theta)$, $\alpha \in \Gamma(\theta)$. This is a contradiction. Thus $\theta_{\Gamma(\theta)} = \theta$. □

Remark 4.7 *(i) From Lemma 4.6 and from Theorem 4.5, we see that a possible rate has the form $n^{-\theta}$, where θ is of the form (4.5), and for a rate of this form, the best choice of the incomplete Taylor scheme (3.25) is $\widetilde{\Gamma} = \Gamma(\theta)$.*

(ii) When $\beta_i = \beta$, $i = 1, \ldots, m$ for $\beta > 1/2$, $\theta = (N+1)\beta - 1$ and $\Gamma(\theta)$ becomes

$$\Gamma(\theta) \ = \ \{\alpha \in \Gamma : |\alpha| \le N\}.$$

So in this case, the best Taylor scheme is the complete Taylor scheme:

$$y_t^n \ = \ y_{t_k}^n + \mathcal{E}_{t_k,t}^{(N)}(y_{t_k}^n), \quad y_0^n = y_0,$$

for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$, $k = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$. According to Theorem 4.5, its convergence rate is $n^{1-(N+1)\beta}$, which coincides with the result obtained in [3].

5 L_p-estimates of weighted random sums and multiple integrals

In the first subsection, we recall some definitions on fractional integrals and derivatives to fix the notation we are going to use. In the subsequent three subsections, we derive some L_p-estimates of weighted random sums and multiple integrals, which are needed to obtain the rate of convergence for the modified Taylor scheme (1.12).

5.1 Elements of fractional calculus

Take $f \in L_1([0,T])$ and $\delta > 0$. The left-sided and right-sided fractional Riemann-Liouville integrals of f of order δ are defined, for almost all $t \in (a,b)$, by

$$I^{\delta}_{a+}f(t) \;=\; \frac{1}{\Gamma(\delta)}\int_a^t (t-s)^{\delta-1}f(s)ds$$

and

$$I^{\delta}_{b-}f(t) \;=\; \frac{1}{\Gamma(\delta)}\int_t^b (s-t)^{\delta-1}f(s)ds,$$

respectively, where $\Gamma(\delta) = \int_0^\infty r^{\delta-1}e^{-r}dr$ is the Gamma function. For $p \geq 1$, let $I^{\delta}_{a+}(L_p([0,T]))$ (respectively $I^{\delta}_{b-}(L_p([0,T]))$) be the class of functions f which may be represented as an I^{δ}_{a+}- (I^{δ}_{b-}-) integral of some L_p-function φ. If $f \in I^{\delta}_{a+}(L_p([0,T]))$ (respectively $f \in I^{\delta}_{b-}(L_p([0,T]))$) and $0 < \delta < 1$ then the fractional Weyl derivative is defined as

$$D^{\delta}_{a+}f(t) \;=\; \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\delta)}\left(\frac{f(t)}{(t-a)^{\delta}} + \delta\int_a^t \frac{f(t)-f(s)}{(t-s)^{\delta+1}}ds\right)\mathbf{1}_{(a,b)}(t)$$

$$\left(\text{resp. } D^{\delta}_{b-}f(t) \;=\; \frac{1}{\Gamma(1-\delta)}\left(\frac{f(t)}{(b-t)^{\delta}} + \delta\int_t^b \frac{f(t)-f(s)}{(s-t)^{\delta+1}}ds\right)\mathbf{1}_{(a,b)}(t)\right),$$

where $a < t < b$.

5.2 L_p-estimate of weighted random sums

Let $\zeta = \{\zeta_{k,n}, n \in \mathbb{N}, k = 0,1,\ldots,n\}$ be a double sequence of random variables. The aim of this subsection is to provide an L_p-estimate of the weighted summations of this sequence, which we need for the rate of convergence of the modified Taylor scheme. We first introduce the space of Hölder continuous functions in L_p.

Definition 5.1 *Let f be a stochastic process on $[0,T]$ such that $f(t) \in L_p$ for each t. We say that f is* Hölder continuous of order β in L_p *if*

$$\|f(t) - f(s)\|_p \;\leq\; K|t-s|^{\beta}, \quad s,t \in [0,T]$$

for $\beta > 0$. We define the seminorm

$$\|f\|_{\beta,p} \;=\; \sup\left\{\frac{\|f(t)-f(s)\|_p}{(t-s)^{\beta}} \,:\, 0 \leq s < t \leq T\right\}.$$

In the following, we denote $t_k = kT/n$, $k = 0,1,\ldots,n$ and $\eta(t) = t_k$ for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$.

Proposition 5.2 *Let $p \geq 1$, $q, q' > p$ such that $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{q'}$ and let β, β' be in $(0,1)$ such that $\beta + \beta' > 1$. Let $\zeta = \{\zeta_{k,n}, n \in \mathbb{N}, k = 0, 1, \ldots, n\}$ satisfy*

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\sum_{k=j+1}^{i} \zeta_{k,n}\right|^q\right) \leq L\left(\frac{i-j}{n}\right)^{\beta' q} \tag{5.1}$$

for all $i, j = 0, 1, \ldots, n$, $i > j$ and for some constant $L > 0$. Let f be a continuous process and assume that f is Hölder continuous of order β in $L_{q'}$. Then for $i, j = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$, $i > j$,

$$\left\|\sum_{k=j+1}^{i} f(t_k)\zeta_{k,n}\right\|_p \leq cL\|f\|_{\beta,q'}\left(\frac{i-j}{n}\right)^{\beta+\beta'} + cL\|f(t_j)\|_{q'}\left(\frac{i-j}{n}\right)^{\beta'},$$

where c is a constant depending on T and the parameters p, q, q', β, β'.

Proof For each $t \in [0,T]$ we denote

$$g_n(t) := \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{nt}{T} \rfloor} \zeta_{k,n}\,.$$

Then we can write

$$\sum_{k=j+1}^{i} f(t_k)\zeta_{k,n} = \int_{(t_j, t_{i+1})} f(t) dg_n(t).$$

We shall use the following fractional integration by parts formula to deal with the above integral (see Theorem 2.4 in [17]).

$$\int_{(a,b)} f dg_n = \int_a^b D^{\delta}_{a+} f_a(t) D^{1-\delta}_{b-} g_{n,b}(t) dt + f(a)(g_n(b-) - g_n(a+)), \tag{5.2}$$

where we denote $f_a(t) = \mathbf{1}_{(a,b)}(t)(f(t) - f(a))$, $g_{n,b}(t) = \mathbf{1}_{(a,b)}(t)(g_n(t) - g_n(b-))$ and $\delta \in [0,1]$.

We denote $a := t_j$ and $b := t_{i+1}$. Let δ be such that $1 - \beta' < \delta < \beta$. By the definition of the fractional derivative it is easy to show that

$$\left\|D^{\delta}_{a+} f_{a+}(t)\right\|_{q'} \leq \frac{\|f\|_{\beta,q'}}{\Gamma(1-\delta)} \frac{\beta}{\beta - \delta}(t-a)^{\beta-\delta}. \tag{5.3}$$

On the other hand,

$$\left\|D^{1-\delta}_{b-} g_{n,b}(t)\right\|_q \leq \frac{1}{\Gamma(\delta)}\left(\left\|\frac{g_n(t) - g_n(b-)}{(b-t)^{1-\delta}}\right\|_q + (1-\delta)\left\|\int_t^b \frac{g_n(t) - g_n(s)}{(s-t)^{2-\delta}} ds\right\|_q\right). \tag{5.4}$$

We first consider the second term on the right-hand side of the above inequality. When $t \geq b - \frac{T}{n}$, we have $g_n(t) - g_n(s) = 0$ and thus the second term is equal to zero. When $t < b - \frac{T}{n}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \int_t^b \frac{g_n(t) - g_n(s)}{(s-t)^{2-\delta}} ds \right\|_q \\
&= \left\| \int_{\eta(t)+\frac{T}{n}}^b \frac{g_n(t) - g_n(s)}{(s-t)^{2-\delta}} ds \right\|_q \leq L \int_{\eta(t)+\frac{T}{n}}^b \frac{[\eta(s) - \eta(t)]^{\beta'}}{(s-t)^{2-\delta}} ds \\
&\leq 2^{\beta'} L \int_{\eta(t)+2\frac{T}{n}}^b (s-t)^{\beta'+\delta-2} ds + L \int_{\eta(t)+\frac{T}{n}}^{\eta(t)+2\frac{T}{n}} \frac{[\eta(s) - \eta(t)]^{\beta'}}{(s-t)^{2-\delta}} ds \\
&\leq \frac{2^{\beta'} L}{\beta' + \delta - 1} (b-t)^{\beta'+\delta-1} + \frac{LT^{\beta'}}{n^{\beta'}(\delta - 1)} [(\eta(t) + 2\frac{T}{n} - t)^{\delta-1} - (\eta(t) + \frac{T}{n} - t)^{\delta-1}] \\
&\leq \frac{2^{\beta'} L}{\beta' + \delta - 1} (b-t)^{\beta'+\delta-1} + \frac{LT^{\beta'}}{n^{\beta'}(1 - \delta)} (\eta(t) + \frac{T}{n} - t)^{\delta-1}, \qquad (5.5)
\end{aligned}$$

where in the first inequality we used the assumption (5.1). For the first term in (5.4), since

$$\|g_n(t) - g_n(b-)\|_q \leq L|b - \frac{T}{n} - \eta(t)|^{\beta'} \leq L|b-t|^{\beta'}$$

for $t \in (a, b)$, we have

$$\left\| \frac{g_n(t) - g_n(b-)}{(b-t)^{1-\delta}} \right\|_q \leq L(b-t)^{\beta'+\delta-1}.$$

Substituting the above inequality and (5.5) into (5.4) we obtain

$$\left\| D_{b-}^{1-\delta} g_{n,b}(t) \right\|_q \quad \leq \quad cL(b-t)^{\beta'+\delta-1} + cLn^{-\beta'}(\eta(t) + \frac{T}{n} - t)^{\delta-1}. \qquad (5.6)$$

By the fractional integration by parts formula (5.2) and by (5.3) and (5.6) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \int_a^b f(t) dg_n(t) \right\|_p \quad &\leq \quad cL\|f\|_{\beta,q'} \int_a^b (t-a)^{\beta-\delta} \left[(b-t)^{\beta'+\delta-1} + n^{-\beta'}(\eta(t) + \frac{T}{n} - t)^{\delta-1} \right] dt \\
&\qquad + \|f(a)\|_{q'}(b-a)^{\beta'} \\
&\leq \quad cL\|f\|_{\beta,q'}(b-a)^{\beta+\beta'} + cL\|f\|_{\beta,q'} \int_a^b (t-a)^{\beta-\delta} n^{-\beta'}(\eta(t) + \frac{T}{n} - t)^{\delta-1} dt \\
&\qquad + \|f(a)\|_{q'}(b-a)^{\beta'}.
\end{aligned}$$

The lemma then follows from the following calculation,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_a^b (t-a)^{\beta-\delta} n^{-\beta'}(\eta(t) + \frac{T}{n} - t)^{\delta-1} dt \\
&\leq n^{-\beta'} \sum_{k=j}^{i-1} (t_{k+1} - a)^{\beta-\delta} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} (\eta(t) + \frac{T}{n} - t)^{\delta-1} dt \\
&\leq n^{-\beta'} \sum_{k=0}^{i-j} \left(\frac{k+1}{n} \right)^{\beta-\delta} \frac{1}{\delta} \left(\frac{T}{n} \right)^{\delta} = cn^{-\beta-\beta'} \sum_{k=0}^{i-j} (k+1)^{\beta-\delta} \\
&\leq cn^{-\beta-\beta'}(i-j)^{1+\beta-\delta} \leq c \left(\frac{i-j}{n} \right)^{\beta+\beta'}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

5.3 Monotonicity in the L_2-norm of multiple integrals

In this subsection we derive a monotonicity result on the L_2-norm of multiple integrals with respect to the fractional Brownian motion. We recall that a standard one-dimensional fractional Brownian motion (fBm) is a centered Gaussian process $B = \{B_t, t \geq 0\}$ with covariance given by

$$\mathbb{E}[B_t B_s] = \frac{1}{2}\left(t^{2H} + s^{2H} - |t-s|^{2H}\right),$$

where $H \in (0,1)$ is the Hurst parameter. Our proof is based on the approximation of multiple integrals by sums of products of fBm increments. Throughout this subsection, we assume that, for $j = 1, \ldots, N$, B^j is either a fBm with Hurst parameter $H_j > 1/2$ or the identity function. Assume in addition that for $j, j' = 1, \ldots, N$, the two processes B^j and $B^{j'}$ are either mutually independent or equal.

We first recall a formula for the expectation of a product of increments. Take an even number r. There are $(r-1)!!$ ways to arrange the elements of $\{1, \ldots, r\}$ into pairs. We denote by $\mathcal{R}_r$ the collection of these ways. Assume that each $\tau \in \mathcal{R}_r$ is of the form $\tau = \{(\tau_1, \tau_2), \ldots, (\tau_{r-1}, \tau_r)\}$, where $\tau_i \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$. For a subinterval $I = (s,t)$ of $[0,T]$, we denote $B_I^j = B_{s,t}^j = B_t^j - B_s^j$. The following is a consequence of the Feynman diagram formula (see [9, page 16]).

Lemma 5.3 *Let I_i, $i = 1, \ldots, r$, be subintervals of $[0,T]$.*
(i) *If B^j, $j = 1, \ldots, r$ are fBms, then the following identity holds true,*

$$\mathbb{E}[B_{I_1}^1 \cdots B_{I_r}^r] = \begin{cases} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{R}_r} \mathbb{E}[B_{I_{\tau_1}}^{\tau_1} B_{I_{\tau_2}}^{\tau_2}] \cdots \mathbb{E}[B_{I_{\tau_{r-1}}}^{\tau_{r-1}} B_{I_{\tau_r}}^{\tau_r}], & r \text{ is even.} \\ 0, & r \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

(ii) *The following inequality holds true,*

$$\mathbb{E}[B_{I_1}^1 \cdots B_{I_r}^r] \geq 0.$$

Proof The first result is the Feynman diagram formula for products of Gaussian random variables. The second result follows from (i) and the fact that the increments of a fBm with Hurst parameter $H > 1/2$ have positive correlation. □

We recall an L_p-convergence result in Proposition 2.2 [7].

Proposition 5.4 *Assume that f and g are stochastic processes which are Hölder continuous of orders μ and λ in L_p (see Definition 5.1) for any $p \geq 1$, respectively, such that $\lambda + \mu > 1$. Assume that $f_0 \in L_p$. Then, the integral $\int_0^T f dg$ exists as a Riemann-Stieltjes integral of L_p-valued functions, and, as a consequence, we have the following convergence in L_p:*

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} f_{t_k} g_{t_k, t_{k+1}} = \int_0^T f dg, \quad \text{where } t_k = kT/n,\ k = 0, 1, \ldots, n.$$

We are ready to prove the main result of this subsection. We will make use of the notation

$$J_r(\mathcal{A}) := \int_0^T \cdots \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}} dB_{s_1}^1 \cdots dB_{s_r}^r$$

for any Borel subset $\mathcal{A} \subset [0,T]^r$ such that the above multiple integral exists as an iterated Riemann-Stieltjes integral defined using L_p-convergence. For any $0 \leq s < t \leq T$, we define

$$[s,t]_<^r = \{(s_1, \ldots, s_r) \in [0,T]^r : s \leq s_1 \leq \cdots \leq s_r \leq t\}.$$

Proposition 5.5 *Let $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \cdots < t_{n-1} < t_n = T$ be a partition of $[0,T]$. Take*

$$\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{k=0}^{n-1} [t_k, t_{k+1}]_<^r , \tag{5.7}$$

and

$$\mathcal{A}' = \bigcup_{k=0}^{n-1} [t_k, t_{k+1}]^r .$$

Then $J_r(\mathcal{A})$ and $J_r(\mathcal{A}')$ are well defined as iterated Riemann-Stieltjes integrals, and we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left(|J_r(\mathcal{A})|^2\right) \;\leq\; \mathbb{E}\left(\left|J_r(\mathcal{A}')\right|^2\right). \tag{5.8}$$

Proof We denote $t_k^l = Tk/l$ and $I_k^l = [t_k^l, t_{k+1}^l]$ for $0 \leq k \leq l$. By Proposition 5.4, it is easy to see that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(|J_r(\mathcal{A})|^2\right) \;=\; \lim_{n_1\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left(\left|\sum_{k=0}^{n_1-1} B^r_{I_k^{n_1}} \int_0^T \cdots \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(s_1,\ldots,s_{r-1},t_k^{n_1}) dB^1_{s_1}\cdots dB^{r-1}_{s_{r-1}}\right|^2\right)$$

Applying Proposition 5.4 several times we obtain

$$\lim_{n_r\to\infty}\cdots\lim_{n_1\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left(\left|\sum_{k_r=0}^{n_r-1}\cdots\sum_{k_1=0}^{n_1-1} B^r_{I_{k_r}^{n_r}}\cdots B^1_{I_{k_1}^{n_1}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(t_{k_1}^{n_1},\ldots,t_{k_r}^{n_r})\right|^2\right) \;=\; \mathbb{E}\left(|J_r(\mathcal{A})|^2\right). \tag{5.9}$$

It is clear that this identity still holds when we replace $\mathcal{A}$ by $\mathcal{A}'$. On the other hand, since $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{A}'$, it follows from Lemma 5.3(ii) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\sum_{k_r=0}^{n_r-1}\cdots\sum_{k_1=0}^{n_1-1} B^r_{I_{k_r}^{n_r}}\cdots B^1_{I_{k_1}^{n_1}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(t_{k_1}^{n_1},\ldots,t_{k_r}^{n_r})\right|^2\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}\left(\left|\sum_{k_r=0}^{n_r-1}\cdots\sum_{k_1=0}^{n_1-1} B^r_{I_{k_r}^{n_r}}\cdots B^1_{I_{k_1}^{n_1}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}'}(t_{k_1}^{n_1},\ldots,t_{k_r}^{n_r})\right|^2\right).
\end{aligned}$$

By taking limits in both sides of the above inequality and taking into account (5.9) we obtain inequality (5.8). □

Remark 5.6 *The monotonicity property in Proposition 5.5 can be generalized to any $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}' \subset [0,T]^r$ such that $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{A}'$ as long as the multiple integrals $J_r(\mathcal{A})$ and $J_r(\mathcal{A}')$ are well defined as iterated Riemann-Stieltjes integrals. The same generalization holds true for the monotonicity property established in Proposition 5.9 below.*

Remark 5.7 *In the same way as in the proof of Proposition 5.5, we can show that*

$$\mathbb{E}\left(J_r(\mathcal{A})\right) \;=\; \lim_{n_r\to\infty}\cdots\lim_{n_1\to\infty} \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{k_r=0}^{n_r-1}\cdots\sum_{k_1=0}^{n_1-1} B^r_{I_{k_r}^{n_r}}\cdots B^1_{I_{k_1}^{n_1}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(t_{k_1}^{n_1},\ldots,t_{k_r}^{n_r})\right). \tag{5.10}$$

So the expectation of the multiple integral $J_r(\mathcal{A})$ is always zero when the number of fBms in $\{B^1,\ldots,B^r\}$ is odd.

Lemma 5.8 *Let I_i, $i = 1, \ldots, 2r$, be subintervals of $[0, T]$, where r is an even number. If B^j, $j = 1, \ldots, 2r$ are fBms, then the following identity holds true,*

$$\mathrm{Cov}(B^1_{I_1} \cdots B^r_{I_r}, B^{r+1}_{I_{r+1}} \cdots B^{2r}_{I_{2r}}) \;=\; \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{R}'_{2r}} \mathbb{E}[B^{\tau_1}_{I_{\tau_1}} B^{\tau_2}_{I_{\tau_2}}] \cdots \mathbb{E}[B^{\tau_{2r-1}}_{I_{\tau_{2r-1}}} B^{\tau_{2r}}_{I_{\tau_{2r}}}],$$

where $\mathcal{R}'_{2r}$ is a subset of $\mathcal{R}_{2r}$ such that for $\tau \in \mathcal{R}_{2r} \setminus \mathcal{R}'_{2r}$, either $\tau_i, \tau_{i+1} \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ or $\tau_i, \tau_{i+1} \in \{r+1, \ldots, 2r\}$, $i = 1, 3, \ldots, 2r-1$. In particular, the covariance of $B^1_{I_1} \cdots B^r_{I_r}$ and $B^{r+1}_{I_{r+1}} \cdots B^{2r}_{I_{2r}}$ is nonnegative.

Proof Note that

$$\mathrm{Cov}(B^1_{I_1} \cdots B^r_{I_r}, B^{r+1}_{I_{r+1}} \cdots B^{2r}_{I_{2r}}) \;=\; \mathbb{E}[B^1_{I_1} \cdots B^{2r}_{I_{2r}}] - \mathbb{E}[B^1_{I_1} \cdots B^r_{I_r}]\mathbb{E}[B^{r+1}_{I_{r+1}} \cdots B^{2r}_{I_{2r}}].$$

The lemma then follows immediately from Lemma 5.3 (i). □

Recall that we define the centered multiple integral as

$$\widetilde{J}_r(\mathcal{A}) \;:=\; J_r(\mathcal{A}) - \mathbb{E}\left[J_r(\mathcal{A})\right].$$

Following is the monotonicity result on the L_2-norm of this multiple integral.

Proposition 5.9 *Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}'$ be as in Proposition 5.5. Then we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\widetilde{J}_r(\mathcal{A})\right|^2\right) \;\le\; \mathbb{E}\left(\left|\widetilde{J}_r(\mathcal{A}')\right|^2\right). \tag{5.11}$$

Proof We first notice that

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\widetilde{J}_r(\mathcal{A})\right|^2\right) \;=\; \mathbb{E}\left(|J_r(\mathcal{A})|^2\right) - \mathbb{E}\left(J_r(\mathcal{A})\right)^2.$$

By applying (5.9) and (5.10) to the above equation, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}\left(\left|\widetilde{J}_r(\mathcal{A})\right|^2\right) \;&=\; \lim_{n_r\to\infty} \cdots \lim_{n_1\to\infty} \Bigg\{ \mathbb{E}\left(\left| \sum_{k_r=0}^{n_r-1} \cdots \sum_{k_1=0}^{n_1-1} B^r_{I^{n_r}_{k_r}} \cdots B^1_{I^{n_1}_{k_1}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(t_{k_1}, \ldots, t_{k_r}) \right|^2 \right) \\
&\qquad - \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{k_r=0}^{n_r-1} \cdots \sum_{k_1=0}^{n_1-1} B^r_{I^{n_r}_{k_r}} \cdots B^1_{I^{n_1}_{k_1}} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(t_{k_1}, \ldots, t_{k_r}) \right)^2 \Bigg\} \\
&=\; \lim_{n_r\to\infty} \cdots \lim_{n_1\to\infty} \sum_{k_r, k'_r=0}^{n_r-1} \cdots \sum_{k_1, k'_1=0}^{n_1-1} \mathrm{Cov}[B^r_{I^{n_r}_{k_r}} \cdots B^1_{I^{n_1}_{k_1}}, B^r_{I^{n_r}_{k'_r}} \cdots B^1_{I^{n_1}_{k'_1}}] \\
&\qquad \times \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(t_{k_1}, \ldots, t_{k_r}) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(t_{k'_1}, \ldots, t_{k'_r}).
\end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

Since $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{A}'$ and $\mathrm{Cov}[B^r_{I^{n_r}_{k_r}} \cdots B^1_{I^{n_1}_{k_1}}, B^r_{I^{n_r}_{k'_r}} \cdots B^1_{I^{n_1}_{k'_1}}] \ge 0$ by Lemma 5.8, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathrm{Cov}[B^r_{I^{n_r}_{k_r}} \cdots B^1_{I^{n_1}_{k_1}}, B^r_{I^{n_r}_{k'_r}} \cdots B^1_{I^{n_1}_{k'_1}}] \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(t_{k_1}, \ldots, t_{k_r}) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(t_{k'_1}, \ldots, t_{k'_r}) \\
&\le \mathrm{Cov}[B^r_{I^{n_r}_{k_r}} \cdots B^1_{I^{n_1}_{k_1}}, B^r_{I^{n_r}_{k'_r}} \cdots B^1_{I^{n_1}_{k'_1}}] \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}'}(t_{k_1}, \ldots, t_{k_r}) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}'}(t_{k'_1}, \ldots, t_{k'_r}).
\end{aligned}$$

By summing over $k_1, k'_1, \ldots, k_r, k'_r$ and taking limits on both sides of the above inequality, and taking into account the identity (5.12), we obtain the inequality (5.11). □

5.4 L_p-estimates of multiple integrals

In this subsection, we assume that B^1 is the identity function and denote $H_1 = 1$, and B^j is a fBm of Hurst parameter $H_j > 1/2$, $j = 2, \ldots, m$. We assume in addition that B^2, $\ldots$, B^m are mutually independent. For $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r) \in \Gamma_r$ (the collection of multi-indices of length r with elements in $\{1, \ldots, m\}$), and $\mathcal{A} \subset [0,T]^r$, we write

$$J_r^\alpha(\mathcal{A}) := \int_0^T \cdots \int_0^T \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(s_1, \ldots, s_r) dB_{s_1}^{\alpha_1} \cdots dB_{s_r}^{\alpha_r},$$

provided that this multiple integral exists, as an integrated Riemann-Stieltjes integral in L_p, for all $p \geq 1$. Recall that $D = \{t_k = kT/n, k = 0, 1, \ldots, n\}$.

Proposition 5.10 *Denote (see (5.7)) $\mathcal{A}_k = [t_k, t_{k+1}]^r_<$, $k = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$. Take $s, t \in D$, $\alpha \in \Gamma_r$, and denote $r' = \#\{i : \alpha_i \neq 1\}$. Then we have*

$$\left\| \sum_{k=ns/T}^{nt/T-1} J_r^\alpha(\mathcal{A}_k) \right\|_2 \quad \leq \quad C\nu_n(\alpha)(t-s)^{1/2}, \tag{5.13}$$

where C is a constant that depends on T, m and α, and

$$\nu_n(\alpha) \quad = \quad \begin{cases} n^{1-H_\alpha} & \text{if} \quad r' \text{ is even}, \\ n^{H-H_\alpha} & \text{if} \quad r' \text{ is odd}. \end{cases} \tag{5.14}$$

Here $H_\alpha := H_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + H_{\alpha_r}$ and $H = \max_{i:\alpha_i \neq 1} H_{\alpha_i}$.

Proof According to Proposition 5.5, it suffices to show that the L_p-estimate holds for $\mathcal{A}_k = [t_k, t_{k+1}]^r$. In this case, we have

$$J_r^\alpha(\mathcal{A}_k) \quad = \quad \prod_{i=1}^r B_{t_k,t_{k+1}}^{\alpha_i} = \prod_{j=1}^m (B_{t_k,t_{k+1}}^j)^{r_j}, \tag{5.15}$$

where $r_j = \#\{i : \alpha_i = j\}$, $j = 1, \ldots, m$ and $r_1 + \cdots + r_m = r$.

We first consider the case when $r_1 = 0$. Denote by μ_q the qth moment of a standard Gaussian random variable $G \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$, that is, $\mu_q = (q-1)!!$ when q is even and $\mu_q = 0$ when q is odd. It is well-known that we have the following Hermite decomposition:

$$x^q \quad = \quad \sum_{p=0}^q \frac{q!}{(q-p)!} \mu_{q-p} H_p(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R},$$

where

$$H_q(x) \quad = \quad \frac{(-1)^q}{q!} e^{\frac{x^2}{2}} \frac{d^q}{dx^q} \left(e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}} \right).$$

If we denote $G_k^j = (\frac{n}{T})^{H_j} B_{t_k,t_{k+1}}^j$, then, applying the above decomposition to (5.15), we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_r^\alpha(\mathcal{A}_k) \quad &= \quad (\frac{n}{T})^{-\sum_{j=2}^m r_j H_j} \prod_{j=2}^m (G_k^j)^{r_j} \\ &= \quad (\frac{n}{T})^{-\sum_{j=2}^m r_j H_j} \prod_{j=2}^m \sum_{p_j=0}^{r_j} \frac{r_j!}{(r_j - p_j)!} \mu_{r_j - p_j} H_{p_j}(G_k^j). \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

Therefore, for any $0 \le k_1 \le k_2 \le n-1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\sum_{k=k_1}^{k_2} J_r^{\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_k)\right\|_2^2 &= \left\|\sum_{k=k_1}^{k_2} (\frac{n}{T})^{-\sum_{j=2}^m r_j H_j} \prod_{j=2}^m \sum_{p_j=0}^{r_j} \frac{r_j!}{(r_j-p_j)!} \mu_{r_j-p_j} H_{p_j}(G_k^j)\right\|_2^2 \\ &\le Cn^{-2\sum_{j=2}^m r_j H_j} \sum_{p_2=0}^{r_1} \cdots \sum_{p_m=0}^{r_m} \left\|\sum_{k=k_1}^{k_2} \prod_{j=2}^m \mu_{r_j-p_j} H_{p_j}(G_k^j)\right\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

Expanding the right-hand side of the above inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\left\|\sum_{k=k_1}^{k_2} \prod_{j=2}^m \mu_{r_j-p_j} H_{p_j}(G_k^j)\right\|_2^2 \\ &= \sum_{k,k'=k_1}^{k_2} \mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{j=2}^m \mu_{r_j-p_j} H_{p_j}(G_k^j) \prod_{j'=2}^m \mu_{r_{j'}-p_{j'}} H_{p_{j'}}(G_{k'}^{j'})\right] \\ &= \sum_{k,k'=k_1}^{k_2} \prod_{j=2}^m \mu_{r_j-p_j}^2 \mathbb{E}\left[H_{p_j}(G_k^j) H_{p_j}(G_{k'}^j)\right] \\ &= \left(\sum_{|k-k'|\le 2} + 2\sum_{k>k'+2}\right) \prod_{j=2}^m \mu_{r_j-p_j}^2 \mathbb{E}\left[H_{p_j}(G_k^j) H_{p_j}(G_{k'}^j)\right] \\ &:= E_1 + E_2. \end{aligned} \tag{5.18}$$

We take $k_1 = \frac{ns}{T}$ and $k_2 = \frac{nt}{T} - 1$. Since

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[H_{p_j}(G_k^j) H_{p_j}(G_{k'}^j)\right] &= \left(\mathbb{E}[G_k^j G_{k'}^j]\right)^{p_j} \\ &= \left(\alpha_{H_j} \int_k^{k+1} \int_{k'}^{k'+1} |u-v|^{2H_j-2} du dv\right)^{p_j}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.19}$$

where $\alpha_{H_j} = H_j(2H_j-1)$, it is easy to see that

$$E_1 \le Cn(t-s). \tag{5.20}$$

On the other hand, from (5.19) we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[H_{p_j}(G_k^j) H_{p_j}(G_{k'}^j)\right] \le C(k-k')^{(2H_j-2)p_j}, \quad k,k' : |k-k'| \ge 2,$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}E_2 &\le C \sum_{k>k'+2} \prod_{j=2}^m \mu_{r_j-p_j}^2 (k-k')^{(2H_j-2)p_j} \\ &= C \sum_{k>k'+2} (k-k')^{\sum_{j=2}^m (2H_j-2)p_j} \prod_{j=2}^m \mu_{r_j-p_j}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{5.21}$$

Since $2H_j - 2 < 0$, the quantity $(k-k')^{(2H_j-2)\sum_{j=2}^m p_j}$ reaches maximum when $p_2 = \cdots = p_m = 0$. So

$$E_2 \le C \sum_{k>k'+2} 1 \le Cn^2(t-s)^2. \tag{5.22}$$

Substituting (5.20) and (5.22) into to (5.18) and taking into account (5.17) and the identity

$$\sum_{j=2}^{m} r_j H_j = H_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + H_{\alpha_r},$$

we obtain inequality (5.13) for the case when r is even.

We turn to the case when $r_1 = 0$ and $r = r'$ is odd. Note that

$$\prod_{j=2}^{m} \mu_{r_j - p_j} \quad \neq \quad 0$$

only if $r_2 - p_2, \ldots, r_m - p_m$ are all even, so for p_j, $j = 2, \ldots, m$ such that $E_2 \neq 0$,

$$\sum_{j=2}^{m} r_j - \sum_{j=2}^{m} p_j = r - \sum_{j=2}^{m} p_j$$

must be even, and so $\sum_{j=2}^{m} p_j$ must be odd. Therefore, for (5.21) we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_2 &\leq C \sum_{k>k'+2} (k-k')^{(2H-2)} \\ &\leq Cn^{2H}(t-s). \end{aligned} \tag{5.23}$$

Substituting the estimates (5.20) and (5.23) into (5.18) and taking into account (5.17), we obtain the estimate (5.13) when r is odd.

In the case $r_1 > 0$, it follows from the identity (5.15) that

$$\left\| \sum_{k=ns/T}^{nt/T-1} J_r^{\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_k) \right\|_2 \quad \leq \quad \left(\frac{T}{n}\right)^{r_1} \left\| \sum_{k=ns/T}^{nt/T-1} \prod_{j=2}^{m} (B^j_{t_k, t_{k+1}})^{r_j} \right\|_2 .$$

Now we can apply the inequality (5.13) for the case $r_1 = 0$ to the right-hand side of the above equation to obtain the inequality (5.13) in the general case. □

Remark 5.11 *By the monotonicity property in Proposition 5.5 we can also show that the rate $1 - H_\alpha$ or $H - H_\alpha$ obtained in Proposition 5.10 is optimal; that is, there exists a constant C such that the right-hand side of inequality (5.13) is the lower bound for the quantity $\left\| \sum_{k=ns/T}^{nt/T-1} J_r^{\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_k) \right\|_2$ with $\mathcal{A}_k = [t_k, t_{k+1}]^r_<$. This follows by taking $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_k$ of the following form:*

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_k := [t_k + \frac{h}{2^r}, t_k + \frac{h}{2^{r-1}}] \times \cdots [t_k + \frac{h}{4}, t_k + \frac{h}{2}] \times [t_k + \frac{h}{2}, t_k + h],$$

where $h = \frac{T}{n}$ and $k = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$. Since $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_k \subset \mathcal{A}_k$, by the monotonicity property, it suffices to find a the lower bound for the quantity

$$\left\| \sum_{k=ns/T}^{nt/T-1} J_r^{\alpha}(\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}_k) \right\|_2 ,$$

which can be done in a similar way as in the proof of Proposition 5.10.

Remark 5.12 *Denote $r_j = \#\{i : \alpha_i = j\}$, $j = 1, \dots, m$. From Remark 5.7 we see that $\mathbb{E}[J_r^\alpha(\mathcal{A})] = 0$ if $(r - r_1)$ is odd. In fact, in a similar way, we can show that $\mathbb{E}[J_r^\alpha(\mathcal{A})] \neq 0$ iff r_j, $j = 2, \dots, m$ are all even numbers.*

We turn to the L_2-estimate of centered multiple integral $\widetilde{J}_r^\alpha(\mathcal{A}) := J_r^\alpha(\mathcal{A}) - \mathbb{E}[J_r^\alpha(\mathcal{A})]$. We shall prove that the rate in (5.13) will be improved and this is the basis for the introduction of the modified Taylor scheme. Recall that $H = \max_{i:\alpha_i \neq 1} H_{\alpha_i}$ and $H_\alpha = H_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + H_{\alpha_r}$.

Proposition 5.13 *Let $\mathcal{A}_k$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ be as in Proposition 5.10. Take $s, t \in D$ and $\alpha \in \Gamma_r$, $r \geq 2$. Denote $r_j = \#\{i : \alpha_i = j\}$, $j = 1, \dots, m$. If r_j, $j = 2, \dots, m$ are even, then we have*

$$\left\| \sum_{k=ns/T}^{nt/T-1} \widetilde{J}_r^\alpha(\mathcal{A}_k) \right\|_p \quad \leq \quad C(t-s)^{1/2} \omega_n(\alpha) \tag{5.24}$$

where

$$\omega_n(\alpha) \quad = \quad \begin{cases} n^{1/2-H_\alpha} & \text{if} \quad \frac{1}{2} < H < \frac{3}{4}\,, \\ n^{1/2-H_\alpha}\sqrt{\log n} & \text{if} \quad H = \frac{3}{4}\,, \\ n^{2H-1-H_\alpha} & \text{if} \quad \frac{3}{4} < H < 1\,. \end{cases}$$

Proof According to Proposition 5.9, it suffices to consider the case when $\mathcal{A}_k = [t_k, t_{k+1}]^r$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$. We first assume that $r_1 = 0$. By (5.16), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[J_r^\alpha(\mathcal{A}_k)] \quad = \quad (\frac{n}{T})^{-\sum_{j=2}^m r_j H_j} \prod_{j=2}^m \mu_{r_j}.$$

So by denoting $\mathcal{P} = \{(p_2, \dots, p_m) : p_j = 0, 1, \dots, r_j,\ j = 2, \dots, m\}$ and $\mathbf{0} = (0, \dots, 0)$ we can write

$$\widetilde{J}_r^\alpha(\mathcal{A}_k) \quad = \quad (\frac{n}{T})^{-\sum_{j=2}^m r_j H_j} \sum_{(p_2,\dots,p_m) \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathbf{0}} \prod_{j=2}^m \frac{r_j!}{(r_j - p_j)!} \mu_{r_j - p_j} H_{p_j}(G_k^j).$$

As in (5.18), we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{k=k_1}^{k_2} \widetilde{J}_r^\alpha(\mathcal{A}_k) \right\|_2^2 \quad &\leq \quad C n^{-2\sum_{j=2}^m r_j H_j} \sum_{(p_2,\dots,p_m) \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathbf{0}} \left\| \sum_{k=k_1}^{k_2} \prod_{j=2}^m \mu_{r_j - p_j} H_{p_j}(G_k^j) \right\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \quad C n^{-2\sum_{j=2}^m r_j H_j} \sum_{(p_2,\dots,p_m) \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathbf{0}} (E_1 + E_2). \end{aligned} \tag{5.25}$$

Since r is even, by the same argument as in the proof of the Proposition 5.10, we see that for p_j, $j = 2, \dots, m$ such that $E_2 \neq 0$, $\sum_{j=2}^m p_j$ must be even. So, for $(p_2, \dots, p_m) \in \mathcal{P} \setminus \mathbf{0}$, we have $\sum_{j=2}^m p_j \geq 2$. This implies

$$E_2 \quad \leq \quad C \sum_{k > k'+2} (k - k')^{2(2H-2)} \leq \begin{cases} Cn(t-s) & \text{if} \quad \frac{1}{2} < H < \frac{3}{4}\,, \\ Cn\log n(t-s) & \text{if} \quad H = \frac{3}{4}\,, \\ Cn^{4H-2}(t-s) & \text{if} \quad \frac{3}{4} < H < 1\,. \end{cases}$$

Applying (5.20) and the above estimate to (5.25), we obtain the upper bound estimate in (5.24).

Finally, the estimate (5.24) for the case $r_1 > 0$ follows immediately from the estimate in the case $r_1 = 0$. □

Remark 5.14 *As in Remark 5.11, we can show that the upper bound in Proposition 5.13 is optimal.*

Remark 5.15 *In terms of ν_n defined in (5.14), inequality (5.24) becomes*

$$\left\| \sum_{k=ns/T}^{nt/T-1} \widetilde{J}_r^{\alpha}(\mathcal{A}_k) \right\|_p \leq C(t-s)^{1/2}\nu_n(\alpha)\sigma_n,$$

where

$$\sigma_n = \begin{cases} n^{-1/2} & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < H < \frac{3}{4}, \\ n^{-1/2}\sqrt{\log n} & \text{if } H = \frac{3}{4}, \\ n^{2H-2} & \text{if } \frac{3}{4} < H < 1. \end{cases} \tag{5.26}$$

Remark 5.16 *For $t \in [0,T]$ and $\gamma \in \Gamma_r$, we define the function*

$$D_\gamma(t) := \mathbb{E}\left[B_{0,t}^{\gamma}\right] = \mathbb{E}[J_r^{\gamma}([0,t]_<^r)].$$

From Remark 5.12, $D_\gamma(t) = 0$ if some $r_j = \#\{i : \gamma_i = j\}$, $j = 2, \dots, m$ is odd. In the following we derive an explicit formula for $D_\gamma(t)$ when all r_j, $j = 2, \dots, m$ are even.

Recall that when r is an even number, the set $\mathcal{R}_r$ is defined in Section 5.3. When r is an odd number, we define $\mathcal{R}_r$ to be the collection of ways to arrange $(1, \dots, r)$ into $(\frac{r-1}{2})$ pairs and one element and we write $\tau = \{(\tau_1, \tau_2), \dots, (\tau_{r-2}, \tau_{r-1}), \tau_r\}$, where τ_i, $i = 1, \dots, r$, are elements in $\{1, \dots, r\}$.

For $r \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $\mathcal{R}(\gamma)$ the subset of $\mathcal{R}_r$ such that for $\tau \in \mathcal{R}(\gamma)$ we have $\gamma_{\tau_i} = \gamma_{\tau_{i+1}}$ for $i = 1, 3, 5, \dots$ and $i < r$, and when r is odd it satisfies an additional condition that $\tau_r = 1$. We denote $\tau^* = \{i = 1, 3, 5, \cdots : \tau_i \neq 1, i < r\}$.

We denote by $\dot{B}_t^j$, $t \in [0,T]$ the fractional white noise associated with the fBm B^j (see [8]), $j = 1, \dots, m$. Since

$$\mathbb{E}[\dot{B}_t^i \dot{B}_s^j] = \alpha_{H_j}|t-s|^{2H_j-2}\delta_{i,j},$$

where $\alpha_{H_j} = H_j(2H_j - 1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[B_{0,t}^{\gamma}\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t \cdots \int_0^{t_2} dB_{t_1}^{\gamma_1} \cdots dB_{t_r}^{\gamma_r}\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t \cdots \int_0^{t_2} \dot{B}_{t_1}^{\gamma_1} \cdots \dot{B}_{t_r}^{\gamma_r} dt_1 \cdots dt_r\right] \\ &= \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{R}(\gamma)} \int_0^t \cdots \int_0^{t_2} \prod_{i \in \tau^*} \alpha_{H_{\tau_i}} |t_{\tau_i} - t_{\tau_{i+1}}|^{2H-2} dt_1 \cdots dt_r. \end{aligned}$$

6 L_p-rates for incomplete and modified Taylor schemes

In this section, we consider the numerical approximation of the solution for the SDE

$$dy_t = V(y_t)dB_t, \quad y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad t \in [0,T], \tag{6.1}$$

where $B = (B^1, \dots, B^m)$ and B^j is a standard fractional Brownian motion (fBm) with Hurst parameter $H_j > 1/2$ for $j = 2, \dots, m$ and B^1 is the identity function. Assume in addition that $B^2, \dots, B^m$ are mutually independent.

6.1 The incomplete Taylor scheme for SDE driven by fBm

In this subsection, we consider the incomplete Taylor scheme (3.25) of the following form

$$\begin{aligned} y_t^n &= y_{t_k}^n + \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{t_k,t}^{(N)}(y_{t_k}^n), \quad t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}], \quad k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1, \quad y_0^n = y_0, \\ \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{s,t}^{(N)}(y) &= \sum_{\gamma \in \widetilde{\Gamma}} \mathcal{V}_\gamma I(y) B_{s,t}^\gamma \,. \end{aligned} \tag{6.2}$$

where $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ is a finite subset of Γ. Recall that $\Gamma = \cup_{r=1}^\infty \Gamma_r$, and Γ_r is the collection of multi-indices of length r with elements in $\{1, \dots, m\}$. We denote $N = \max_{\gamma \in \widetilde{\Gamma}} |\gamma|$.

Take $\alpha \in \Gamma$. Denote $r'(\alpha) = \#\{i : \alpha_i \neq 1\}$ and

$$\vartheta(\alpha) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{when } r'(\alpha) \text{ is even} \\ \max\limits_{i:\alpha_i \neq 1} H_{\alpha_i} & \text{when } r'(\alpha) \text{ is odd} \end{cases}.$$

We define

$$\rho = \rho_{\widetilde{\Gamma}} = \min\left\{ H_\alpha - \vartheta(\alpha)\,,\ \alpha \in \Gamma \setminus \widetilde{\Gamma} \right\}, \tag{6.3}$$

where recall that $H_\alpha = H_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + H_{\alpha_r}$ for $\alpha \in \Gamma_r$.

We first derive two auxiliary results. We take β such that $1/2 < \beta < \min_j H_j$.

Lemma 6.1 *Let $R_{s,t}^e$, $e = 1, 3, 4$ be defined by (3.16), (3.22) and (3.23). Assume that $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ has the hierarchical structure introduced in Definition 3.7. Assume that $V \in C_b^{N+2}$. Then the following estimate holds for any $i > j$*

$$\left\| \sum_{k=j}^{i-1} R_{t_k,t_{k+1}}^e(y_{t_k}^n) \right\|_p \ \leq \ Cn^{-\rho} \left(\frac{i-j}{n} \right)^{1/2} \qquad e = 1, 3, 4\,. \tag{6.4}$$

Proof According to Proposition 3.8, $R_{t_k,t_{k+1}}^e(y_{t_k}^n)$, $e = 1, 3, 4$, are the summations of quantities of the form $U(y_{t_k}^n) B_{t_k,t_{k+1}}^\alpha$ for $\alpha \in \Gamma \setminus \widetilde{\Gamma}$. Since $V \in C_b^{N+2}$, it is easy to see from Proposition 3.8 that $U \in C_b^1$. To prove the lemma, it suffices to show that the L_p-estimate (6.4) holds true for

$$\sum_{k=j}^{i-1} U(y_{t_k}^n) B_{t_k,t_{k+1}}^\alpha, \quad \alpha \in \Gamma \setminus \widetilde{\Gamma}\,. \tag{6.5}$$

By Proposition 5.10 and the definition of ρ we have

$$\left\| \sum_{k=j}^{i-1} B_{t_k,t_{k+1}}^\alpha \right\|_p \ \leq \ Cn^{-\rho} \left(\frac{i-j}{n} \right)^{1/2}.$$

On the other hand, Lemma 4.1 implies that $\|y^n\|_{\beta,p} \leq C$. So we can apply Proposition 5.2 to the quantity (6.5) to obtain the estimate

$$\left\| \sum_{k=j}^{i-1} U(y_{t_k}^n) B_{t_k,t_{k+1}}^\alpha \right\|_p \ \leq \ Cn^{-\rho} \left(\frac{i-j}{n} \right)^{1/2}.$$

This completes the proof. □

Lemma 6.2 *Let f be a stochastic process on $[0,T]$, such that $\mathbb{E}(\|f\|_\beta^p)$ and $\mathbb{E}(\|f\|_\infty^p)$ are finite for all $p \geq 1$. Let $\widetilde{\Gamma}$, $R^e_{s,t}(y)$, $e = 1,3,4$ and V be as in Lemma 6.1 and let $R^e_{s,t}(y)$ be defined in (3.21). Then the following estimate is true for $e = 1,2,3,4$ and $l = 0,1,\ldots,n-1$,*

$$\left\| \sum_{k=0}^{l} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} f_u dR^e_{t_k,u}(y^n_{t_k}) \right\|_p \quad \leq \quad Kn^{-\rho}, \tag{6.6}$$

where K depends on $\mathbb{E}(\|f\|_\beta^p)$, $\mathbb{E}(\|f\|_\infty^p)$ and the vector fields V_j.

Proof: According to the estimate (4.3) in Lemma 4.4 and taking into account the assumption that $\mathbb{E}(\|f\|_\beta^p)$ and $\mathbb{E}(\|f\|_\infty^p)$ are finite, we have

$$\left\| \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} f_u dR^2_{t_k,u}(y^n_{t_k}) \right\|_p \quad \leq \quad Kn^{-(N+2)\beta},$$

where we recall that $N = \max_{\gamma \in \widetilde{\Gamma}} |\gamma|$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{k=0}^{l} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} f_u dR^2_{t_k,u}(y^n_{t_k}) \right\|_p &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left\| \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} f_u dR^2_{t_k,u}(y^n_{t_k}) \right\|_p \\ &\leq Kn^{1-(N+2)\beta} \\ &\leq Kn^{-\rho}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows by taking β sufficiently close to $\min_j H_j$ and the fact that we can find $\alpha \in \Gamma_{N+1}$ such that $H_\alpha - \vartheta(\alpha) < (N+2)\beta - 1$.

We turn to the case $e = 1,3,4$. We write

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} f_u dR^e_{t_k,u}(y^n_{t_k}) &= \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^{u} df_v dR^e_{t_k,u}(y^n_{t_k}) + f_{t_k} R^e_{t_k,t_{k+1}}(y^n_{t_k}) \\ &=: R^{e,1}_k + R^{e,2}_k. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Proposition 5.2 to $\sum_{k=0}^{l} R^{e,2}_k$ and taking into account the estimate in Lemma 6.1 and the assumption that $\|f\|_{\beta,p}$ is finite, we obtain the inequality

$$\left\| \sum_{k=0}^{l} R^{e,2}_k \right\|_p \quad \leq \quad Kn^{-\rho}. \tag{6.7}$$

According to Proposition 3.8, the quantity $R^{e,1}_k$ is a linear combination of the terms

$$\int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^{u} df_v dB^\alpha_{t_k,u}, \quad \alpha \notin \widetilde{\Gamma}.$$

Take $\beta_j < H_j$ for $j = 1,\ldots,m$. Then by Lemma 8.2 we have

$$\left\| \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \int_{t_k}^{u} df_v dB^\alpha_{t_k,u} \right\|_p \leq Kn^{-\beta_{\alpha_1} - \cdots - \beta_{\alpha_p} - \beta} \leq Kn^{-\rho-1},$$

where the last inequality follows by taking β_j, $j = 1,\ldots,m$ sufficiently close to H_j and β to $\min_j H_j$. Therefore,

$$\left\| \sum_{k=0}^{l} R^{e,1}_k \right\|_p \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \left\| R^{e,1}_k \right\|_p \leq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} Kn^{-\rho-1} = Kn^{-\rho}. \tag{6.8}$$

Combining (6.7) and (6.8), we obtain the inequality (6.6) for $e = 1,3,4$. □

Theorem 6.3 *Let $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ be a finite subset of Γ. Assume that $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ satisfies the hierarchical structure defined in Definition 3.7. Let y be the solution of equation (6.1) and y^n be the solution of numerical equation (6.2) with $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}^{(N)}_{s,t}$ defined in (6.2). Take $M > 0$. Assume that $V \in C_b^{N+2}$. Then*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \left(\mathbb{E}|\mathbf{1}_{\{\|B\|_\beta<M\}}(y_t - y_t^n)|^p\right)^{1/p} \quad \leq \quad C_M n^{-\rho}, \tag{6.9}$$

where C_M is a constant depending on M.

Proof By Theorem 3.11, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{1}_{\{\|B\|_\beta<M\}}(y_t - y_t^n) \\
&= \sum_{e=1}^{4} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\{\|B\|_\beta<M\}}\Phi_t\right] \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{nt}{T} \rfloor} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}\wedge t} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\{\|B\|_\beta<M\}}\Psi_s\right] dR^e_{t_k,s}(y^n_{t_k}),
\end{aligned}$$

where Φ and Ψ are solutions of equations (3.29) and (3.30). According to the estimate of $\|\Phi\|_\infty$ in Lemma 4.1, the L_p-norm of the quantity $\mathbf{1}_{\{\|B\|_\beta<M\}}\Phi_t$ is less than a constant C_M is independent of n. So to prove the theorem, it suffices to show that the L_p-norm of

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{nt}{T} \rfloor} \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}\wedge t} \left[\mathbf{1}_{\{\|B\|_\beta<M\}}\Psi_s\right] dR^e_{t_k,s}(y^n_{t_k}) \tag{6.10}$$

is less than $C_M n^{-\rho}$. We take $f_s = \mathbf{1}_{\{\|B\|_\beta<M\}}\Psi_s$, then it follows again from Lemma 4.1 that $\mathbb{E}[\|f\|^p_\beta]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|f\|^p_\infty]$ are bounded by a constant independent of n. So applying Lemma 6.2 to (6.10) we obtain the upper bound $C_M n^{-\rho}$. This completes the proof. □

Remark 6.4 *With more careful estimates in Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2 and with the help of Remark 5.11, we can show that the convergence rate of the incomplete Taylor scheme obtained in Theorem 6.3 is optimal, that is, we can find a constant C such that the left-hand side of (6.9) is greater than its right-hand side.*

The following result follows immediately from Theorem 6.3.

Corollary 6.5 *Let the assumption be as in Theorem 6.3. The scaled error $n^\rho(y_t - y_t^n)$, $t \in [0,T]$ of the numerical scheme is bounded in probability (or tight), that is, for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$P(n^\rho|y_t - y_t^n| > C) \leq \varepsilon \quad \textit{for all } n.$$

To obtain the best choice of $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ by Theorem 6.3, we will follow the same ideas as in (4.5) and (4.6). Take nonnegative integers $r_1, \ldots, r_m$ and denote $r' = \sum_{j=2}^m r_j$. First, we see that a possible L_p-rate has the form

$$\rho = \begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^m r_j H_j - 1 & \text{if } r' \text{ is even} \\ \sum_{j=1}^m r_j H_j - \max\limits_{j>1:\, r_j>0} H_j & \text{if } r' \text{ is odd}. \end{cases} \tag{6.11}$$

Given a ρ of the above form we define

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\Gamma}(\rho) \quad &= \quad \left\{\alpha \in \Gamma : H_\alpha - 1 < \rho,\ r'(\alpha) \text{ is even}\right\} \\
&\qquad \bigcup \left\{\alpha \in \Gamma : H_\alpha - \max_{j:\alpha_j \neq 1} H_{\alpha_j} < \rho,\ r'(\alpha) \text{ is odd}\right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

Lemma 6.6 *Given a ρ of the form (6.11), we define $\widehat{\Gamma}(\rho)$ by (6.12). Then*

$$\rho_{\widehat{\Gamma}(\rho)} = \rho\,.$$

Proof The proof of this lemma is similar to that of Lemma 4.6. □

Remark 6.7 *From this lemma and Theorem 6.3, we see that all possible rates for the L_p-convergence has the form (6.11). Given a rate of the form (6.11) the best choice of $\widetilde{\Gamma}$ in (6.2) for the L_p-convergence is (6.12).*

Remark 6.8 *We compare Theorem 6.3 to the strong convergence results in [5, 10]. We consider the d-dimensional Stratonovich SDE:*

$$y_t = y_0 + \int_0^t V(y_s)dW_s,$$

where $W = (W^1, \dots, W^m)$, W^j is a standard Brownian motion for $j = 2, \dots, m$, $W_t^1 \equiv t$ and W^j, $j = 2, \dots, m$ are mutually independent, and the integral on the right-hand side is a Stratonovich integral. The numerical scheme studied in [10] coincides with the incomplete Taylor scheme (6.2) constructed here. Indeed, by taking $H_j = 1/2$, $j = 2, \dots, m$ and $H_1 = 1$ in (6.11) we see that the possible rates of convergence are $\{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$, and for $\rho = 1, 2, \dots$, the set $\widehat{\Gamma}(\rho)$ becomes

$$\widehat{\Gamma}(\rho) \;=\; \{\alpha \in \Gamma : r'(\alpha) + 2r_1(\alpha) < 2\rho + 1\},$$

or

$$\widehat{\Gamma}(\rho) \;=\; \{\alpha \in \Gamma : |\alpha| + r_1(\alpha) \le 2\rho\}, \tag{6.13}$$

where $r_1(\alpha) = \#\{i : \alpha_i = 1\}$, $r'(\alpha) = \#\{i : \alpha_i \neq 1\}$ and $|\alpha|$ is the length of α. By taking

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{s,t}^{(N)}(y) \;=\; \sum_{\gamma \in \widehat{\Gamma}(\rho)} \mathcal{V}_\gamma I(y) W_{s,t}^\gamma\,,$$

with $\widehat{\Gamma}(\rho)$ defined in (6.13), we obtain the numerical scheme considered in [10]:

$$y_t^n \;=\; y_{t_k}^n + \widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{t_k,t}^{(N)}(y_{t_k}^n), \quad y_0^n = y_0,$$

for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$, $k = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$. The following strong convergence result is obtained in [10]:

$$\mathbb{E}(|y_t - y_t^n|^2)^{1/2} \;\le\; Cn^{-\rho}.$$

In particular, the convergence rate $n^{-\rho}$ of the incomplete Taylor scheme in the Brownian case coincides with the convergence rate in the fBm case. So we can consider Theorem 6.3 as a generalization of [10] to the fBm case.

Example 6.9 *We consider the scalar SDE*

$$y_t \;=\; y_0 + \int_0^t V(y_s)dB_s, \quad y_0 \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{6.14}$$

where B is a one-dimensional fBm with Hurst parameter $H > 1/2$. Take $N \in \mathbb{N}$. The order-N Taylor expansion in this case is

$$\mathcal{E}_{s,t}^{(N)}(y) \;=\; \frac{1}{r!}\sum_{r=1}^{N} \mathcal{V}_r I(y)(B_t - B_s)^r,$$

where $\mathcal{V}_1 = \mathcal{V}$, and $\mathcal{V}_{r+1} = \mathcal{V}_r\mathcal{V}$, r=1,..., N. So the global numerical scheme associated with this Taylor expansion is

$$y_t^n = y_{t_k}^n + \frac{1}{r!}\sum_{r=1}^{N}\mathcal{V}_r I(y_{t_k}^n)(B_t - B_{t_k})^r, \quad t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]. \tag{6.15}$$

This is the numerical scheme studied in [4]. By taking $m = d = 1$, we recover from Theorem 6.3 the strong convergence result of (6.15) obtained in [4]: the numerical scheme y^n defined in (6.15) converges to the solution y of (6.14) with rate $n^{1-(N+1)H}$ when N is odd and with rate n^{-NH} when N is even.

6.2 Modified Taylor scheme

In this subsection, we briefly explain how to improve the convergence rate of the numerical scheme studied in Section 6.1 by a slight modification of the scheme. The proof of the main result in this subsection is similar to the previous subsection, and the proof is omitted.

By comparing Proposition 5.10 with Proposition 5.13, we see that the centered multiple integral

$$\widetilde{J}_r(\mathcal{A}) = J_r(\mathcal{A}) - \mathbb{E}\left[J_r(\mathcal{A})\right],$$

usually will have a smaller L_2-norm, where $\mathcal{A}$ is a subset of $[0,T]^r$ such that the multiple integral $J_r(\mathcal{A})$ is well defined. This leads us to consider the following modification of the Taylor expansion.

Take nonnegative integers $r_1, \ldots, r_m$ and denote $r' = \sum_{j=2}^m r_j$. Let ρ be of the form

$$\rho = \begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^m r_j H_j - 1 & if\ r' \text{ is even} \\ \sum_{j=1}^m r_j H_j - \max\limits_{j>1:\, r_j>0} H_j & if\ r' \text{ is odd} \end{cases}, \tag{6.16}$$

and define

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Gamma}(\rho) = &\{\alpha \in \Gamma : H_\alpha - 1 < \rho,\ r'(\alpha) \text{ is even}\} \\ &\bigcup \{\alpha \in \Gamma : H_\alpha - \max_{j:\, \alpha_j \neq 1} H_{\alpha_j} < \rho,\ r'(\alpha) \text{ is odd}\}, \end{aligned}$$

where recall that $H_\alpha = H_{\alpha_1} + \cdots + H_{\alpha_r}$ and $r'(\alpha) = \#\{i : \alpha_i \neq 1\}$.

We denote $\rho' = \min\{\delta : \delta \text{ is of the form (6.16) and } \delta > \rho\}$, and define $\widehat{\Gamma}(\rho)' := \widehat{\Gamma}(\rho') \setminus \widehat{\Gamma}(\rho)$. Recall that we define the function $D_\gamma(t) := \mathbb{E}\left[B_{0,t}^\gamma\right]$; see Remark 5.16 for an explicit expression.

Definition 6.10 *Let ρ be of the form (6.16). We call*

$$\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_{s,t}(y) = \sum_{\gamma \in \widehat{\Gamma}(\rho)} \mathcal{V}_\gamma I(y) B_{s,t}^\gamma + \sum_{\gamma \in \widehat{\Gamma}(\rho)'} \mathcal{V}_\gamma I(y) D_\gamma(t-s)$$

the modified Taylor expansion.

Remark 6.11 *In Proposition 3.5 we have shown that the identity (3.20) holds for the incomplete Taylor expansion $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{s,t}^{(N)}$. In fact, (3.20) also holds true when $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{s,t}^{(N)}$ is replaced by the Taylor expansion $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_{s,t}$. In fact, the only properties of the incomplete Taylor expansion $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{s,t}^{(N)}$ we used in the proof of the proposition are:*

1. *The multiple integrals appearing in the proof are well defined;*
2. *the chain rule used in (3.24) holds true.*

We consider the following modified Taylor scheme:

$$y_t^n = y_{t_k}^n + \widehat{\mathcal{E}}_{t_k,t}(y_{t_k}^n), \quad t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}], \quad k = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1. \tag{6.17}$$

As in Remark 6.11, it is easy to show that if R^e, $e = 1, 2, 3, 4$ are defined in (3.16), (3.21), (3.22) and (3.23) with $\widetilde{\mathcal{E}}_{s,t}^{(N)}$ replaced by $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_{s,t}$ and y^n is the modified Taylor scheme (6.17), then identity (3.31) still holds true.

Based on estimate (5.24) and identity (3.31), we can prove the following stronger convergence result. Recall that for $\alpha \in \Gamma$, we denote $r_j(\alpha) = \#\{i : \alpha_i = j\}$, $j = 1, \ldots, m$.

Theorem 6.12 *Assume that $V \in C_b^{N+2}$. Let y be the solution of equation (6.1) and y^n be the numerical scheme (6.17). Take $M > 0$. If $r_j(\alpha)$, $j = 2, \ldots, m$ is even for each $\alpha \in \widehat{\Gamma}(\rho)'$, then*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \left(\mathbb{E}|\mathbf{1}_{\{\|B\|_\beta < M\}}(y_t - y_t^n)|^p\right)^{1/p} \leq C_M n^{-\rho}\sigma_n,$$

where σ_n is defined in (5.26) and C_M is a constant depending on M. In particular, the scaled error $\sigma_n^{-1} n^\rho (y_t - y_t^n)$ is bounded in probability for each $t \in [0, T]$.

Remark 6.13 *As in Remark 6.4, we can show that the convergence rate obtained in Theorem 6.12 is optimal.*

Following are two applications of the modified Taylor scheme. For simplicity, we assume from now on that $B = (B^1, \ldots, B^m)$ is a m-dimensional standard fBm with Hurst parameter $H > 1/2$.

Example 6.14 *Take $\rho = 2H - 1$. Then $\widehat{\Gamma}(\rho) = \{1, \ldots, m\}$ and $N = 1$. Take $\gamma \in \Gamma$ such that $|\gamma| = N + 1 = 2$, and denote $\gamma = (j, j')$. We calculate $D_\gamma(t)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} D_\gamma(t) = \mathbb{E}[B_{0,t}^\gamma] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^t \int_0^u dB_{u'}^j dB_u^{j'}\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} t^{2H} \delta_{jj'}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_{jj'}$ is the Kronecker function such that $\delta_{jj'} = 1$ when $j = j'$ and $\delta_{jj'} = 0$ other wise. Then the modified order-2 Taylor expansion is

$$\widehat{\mathcal{E}}(y) = V(y)B_{s,t} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^d V_j^i \partial_i V_j(y)(t-s)^{2H}.$$

The modified Taylor scheme associated with this scheme is

$$y_{t_{k+1}}^n = y_{t_k}^n + V(y_{t_k}^n)B_{t_k,t_{k+1}} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j=1}^m (\partial V_j V_j)(y_{t_k}^n)(T/n)^{2H},$$

for $k = 0, \ldots, n-1$. This is the modified Euler scheme introduced in [7]. By taking $\rho = 2H - 1$ we recover from Theorem 6.12 the convergence result (1.11).

Example 6.15 *Let N be an odd integer. We consider the model in Example 6.9. The modified Taylor expansion for this model becomes*

$$\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_{s,t}(y) = \sum_{r=1}^N \frac{1}{r!}\mathcal{V}_r I(y)(B_t - B_s)^r + \frac{1}{(N+1)!!}\mathcal{V}_{N+1} I(y)(t-s)^{(N+1)H}.$$

The modified Taylor scheme associated with this scheme is

$$\begin{aligned} y^n_{t_{k+1}} &= y^n_{t_k} + \sum_{r=1}^{N} \frac{1}{r!} \mathcal{V}_r I(y^n_{t_k})(B_{t_{k+1}} - B_{t_k})^r \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{(N+1)!!} \mathcal{V}_{N+1} I(y^n_{t_k})(T/n)^{(N+1)H}. \end{aligned}$$

According to Theorem 6.12, the convergence rate of this scheme is $n^{1/2-H(N+1)}$ *for* $1/2 < H < 3/4$*;* $n^{1/2-3(N+1)/4}\sqrt{\log n}$ *for* $H = 3/4$ *and* $n^{-1-H(N-1)}$ *for* $H > 3/4$*, which improves the numerical scheme (6.15).*

7 Numerical approximation in the rough paths case

In this section, we consider the numerical approximation for the d-dimensional rough differential equation:

$$dy_t = V(y_t)dx_t \tag{7.1}$$

on $[0,T]$, where the control function $x \in C([0,T],\mathbb{R}^m)$ is not differentiable, but is enriched with a proper algebraic structure. The theory of rough paths analysis has been developed from the seminal paper by Lyons [12]. Our settings in this section will follow closely [3].

As in (3.2), we can define the Taylor scheme for the solution of (7.1) based on the Taylor expansion:

$$\mathcal{E}^{(N)}_{s,t}(y) = \sum_{\gamma\in\Gamma,|\gamma|\le N} \mathcal{V}_\gamma I(y) x^\gamma_{s,t}, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^d,$$

where $x^\gamma_{s,t}$ is a multiple rough integral that we will define later. Our aim in this section is to show that the expression for $y - y^n$ derived in (3.31), still holds true in the rough paths case. Notice that the results in Section 3.1 are only based on the algebraic properties of the differential equation (3.1), so to show (3.31), it suffices to derive a rough paths version of Proposition 2.10.

In the first subsection, we briefly review some concepts and results from the rough paths theory. In the second subsection, we generalize Proposition 2.10 to the rough paths case.

7.1 Elements of the rough paths theory

Denote by $C^{p\text{-var}}([s,t])$ the collection of continuous functions on $[s,t]$ with bounded p-variation. We first define the step-N signature.

Definition 7.1 *The step-N signature of $\gamma \in C^{1\text{-}var}([s,t];\mathbb{R}^m)$ is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} S_N(\gamma)_{s,t} &\equiv \left(1, \int_{s<u<t} d\gamma_u, \ldots, \int_{s<u_1<\cdots<u_N<t} d\gamma_{u_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes d\gamma_{u_N}\right) \\ &\in \oplus_{k=0}^N (\mathbb{R}^m)^{\otimes k}. \end{aligned}$$

We denote by $G^N(\mathbb{R}^m)$ the so-called *free nilpotent group of step N* over $\mathbb{R}^m$, that is,

$$G^N(\mathbb{R}^m) := \left\{ S_N(\gamma)_{0,1} : \gamma \in C^{1\text{-var}}([0,1];\, \mathbb{R}^m) \right\}.$$

It is well-known that $G^N(\mathbb{R}^m)$ is a Lie group with respect to the tensor multiplication $\otimes$, and for every $g \in G^N(\mathbb{R}^m)$, the "Carnot-Carathéodory norm"

$$\|g\| := \inf\left\{ \int_0^1 |d\gamma| : \gamma \in C^{1\text{-var}}([0,1];\, \mathbb{R}^m) \text{ and } S_N(\gamma)_{0,1} = g \right\}$$

is finite and achieved at some minimizing path γ^*, i.e.

$$\|g\| = \int_0^1 |d\gamma^*| \text{ and } S_N(\gamma^*)_{0,1} = g\,.$$

The norm $\|\cdot\|$ leads to a metric $d(g,h) := \|g^{-1}\otimes h\|$ on $G^N(\mathbb{R}^m)$, called the *Carnot-Carathéodory metric*.

Consider a $G^N(\mathbb{R}^m)$-valued path $\mathbf{x}$ on the time interval $[0,T]$. For any $p\geq 1$, we denote by

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_{p\text{-var};[s,t]} \quad = \quad \sup_{(t_i)\subset[s,t]} \left(\sum_i d(\mathbf{x}_{t_i},\mathbf{x}_{t_{i+1}})^p\right)^{1/p}$$

the p-variation norm of $\mathbf{x}$, and when $s=0$, $t=T$, we simply write $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{p\text{-var}} = \|\mathbf{x}\|_{p\text{-var};[0,T]}$. The following proposition shows that an abstract path $\mathbf{x}:[0,T]\to G^N(\mathbb{R}^m)$ of bounded p-variation can be approximated by a sequence of step-N signatures; see [3]. We denote by d_∞ the infinity distance, that is,

$$d_\infty(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{x}') := \sup_{t\in[0,T]} d(\mathbf{x}_t,\mathbf{x}'_t),$$

and $C^{p\text{-var}}([0,T];G^N(\mathbb{R}^m))$ stands for

$$\left\{\mathbf{x}\in C([0,T];G^N(\mathbb{R}^m)) : \|\mathbf{x}\|_{p\text{-var}}<\infty\right\}.$$

Proposition 7.2 *Let $\mathbf{x}\in C^{p\text{-}var}([0,T];G^N(\mathbb{R}^m))$, $p\geq 1$, with $\mathbf{x}_0=(1,0,\dots,0)$. Then there exists $(x^n)_n\subset C^1([0,T];\mathbb{R}^m)$, such that*

$$d_\infty(\mathbf{x},S_N(x^n))\to 0 \text{ as } n\to\infty, \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_n \|S_N(x^n)\|_{p\text{-}var}<\infty.$$

Consider the *rough differential equation* (RDE)

$$dy_t = V(y_t)d\mathbf{x}_t, \quad y_0\in\mathbb{R}^d, \tag{7.2}$$

where $\mathbf{x}:[0,T]\to G^{\lfloor p\rfloor}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ is a *weak geometric p-rough path*, i.e. an element in $C^{p\text{-var}}([0,T];G^{\lfloor p\rfloor}(\mathbb{R}^m))$.

Definition 7.3 *We take $\mathbf{x}\in C^{p\text{-}var}([0,T];G^{\lfloor p\rfloor}(\mathbb{R}^m))$. We say that $y\in C([0,T];G^{\lfloor p\rfloor}(\mathbb{R}^d))$ is a solution to equation (7.2) if for any sequence $(x^n)_n$ in $C^{1\text{-}var}([0,T];\mathbb{R}^m)$ such that*

$$d_\infty(\mathbf{x},S_{\lfloor p\rfloor}(x^n))\to 0 \text{ as } n\to\infty, \text{ and } \sup_n \|S_{\lfloor p\rfloor}(x^n)\|_{p\text{-}var}<\infty, \tag{7.3}$$

with y^n the solution of the equation $dy^n = V(y^n)dx^n$, there exists a subsequence of (x^n,y^n) (which we still denote by (x^n,y^n)) such that y^n converges uniformly to y when $n\to\infty$.

Theorem 7.4 *Assume that $V=(V_j)_{1\leq j\leq m}$ is a collection of $C_b^{\lfloor p\rfloor+1}$-vector fields on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Then, there exists a unique RDE solution to the equation (7.2). The conclusion still holds when $V=(V_j)_{1\leq j\leq m}$ is a collection of linear vector fields.*

To define the rough path integral $\int_0^\cdot V(x_t)d\mathbf{x}_t$, we consider the following RDE

$$\begin{aligned} dz_t &= d\mathbf{x}_t,\\ dy_t &= V(z_t)d\mathbf{x}_t,\\ (z_0,y_0) &= (0,0). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Theorem 7.4 that if $V\in C_b^{\lfloor p\rfloor+1}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then the above equation has a unique solution (z,y). We call y the *rough integral*, denoted as $\int_0^\cdot V(x_t)d\mathbf{x}_t$.

7.2 Multiple rough integrals

In this subsection, we consider some multiple rough integrals. We denote by $S_N(\mathbf{x})$, $N \geq \lfloor p \rfloor$, the so-called *Lyons lift* of $\mathbf{x}$, which satisfies $\pi_i(S_N(\mathbf{x})) = \pi_i(\mathbf{x})$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \lfloor p \rfloor$ and $S_N(\mathbf{x}) \in C^{p\text{-var}}([0,T]; G^N(\mathbb{R}^m))$. We refer to Section 9.1.2 in [3] for the proof of the existence and uniqueness for the *Lyons lift* of a weak geometric p-rough path. Following is a basic fact on weak geometric rough paths. It shows that if $\mathbf{x}$ is a weak geometric p-rough path, $p \geq 1$, then the multiple integral

$$\int_s^t \cdots \int_s^{u_2} d\mathbf{x}_{u_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes d\mathbf{x}_{u_i}, \quad s, t \in [0,T],$$

coincides with the ith tensor level of the order-N *Lyons's lift* of $\mathbf{x}$, where $N \geq i$.

Lemma 7.5 *Let $\mathbf{x}$ be a weak geometric p-rough path and $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Then for each $i = 1, \ldots, N$, we have*

$$\pi_i(S_N(\mathbf{x})_{s,t}) = \int_s^t \int_s^{t_i} \cdots \int_s^{t_2} d\mathbf{x}_{t_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes d\mathbf{x}_{t_{i-1}} \otimes d\mathbf{x}_{t_i}\,.$$

Proof Without loss of generality, we assume $s = 0$. We consider the following linear system of equations

$$\begin{aligned} dz_t^1 &= d\mathbf{x}_t \\ dz_t^2 &= z_t^1 \otimes d\mathbf{x}_t \\ &\cdots \\ dz_t^N &= z_t^{N-1} \otimes d\mathbf{x}_t, \end{aligned}$$

with the initial value $(\mathbf{z}_0^1, \ldots, \mathbf{z}_0^N) = 0$. For convenience, we denote the equation system by

$$dz_t = V(z_t) d\mathbf{x}_t, \quad z_0 = 0, \tag{7.4}$$

where $V = (V_1, \ldots, V_m)$ and $V_j(z) = A^j z + b^j$. It is easy to see that A^j and b^j are $(\sum_{i=1}^N m^i) \times (\sum_{i=1}^N m^i)$ and $(\sum_{i=1}^N m^i) \times 1$ matrices, respectively, whose entries take values 0 and 1. According to Theorem 7.4, the above equation system has a unique solution. In fact, it can be verified directly that

$$z_t^i = \int_0^t \int_0^{t_i} \cdots \int_0^{t_2} d\mathbf{x}_{t_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes d\mathbf{x}_{t_{i-1}} \otimes d\mathbf{x}_{t_i}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N.$$

According to the definition of solution of RDE, for any sequence $(x^n)_n$ in $C^{1\text{-var}}([0,T]; \mathbb{R}^m)$ satisfying (7.3), there exists a subsequence of $(x^n)_n$ (which we still denote by $(x^n)_n$) such that $S_N(x^n)$ converges to the solution $(1, z^1, \ldots, z^N)$ of (7.4) uniformly. On the other hand, according to Proposition 7.2, we can choose the sequence $(x^n)_n$ such that $S_N(x^n)$ converges to $S_N(\mathbf{x})$ uniformly. Therefore, we must have $S_N(\mathbf{x}) = (1, z^1, \ldots, z^N)$. This completes the proof. □

Following is our main result in this subsection, which can be shown by approximation and with the help of Proposition 2.10 and Lemma 7.5. For $\alpha \in \Gamma$ such that $|\alpha| = r$, we denote

$$x_{s,t}^\alpha := \pi_r(S_r(\mathbf{x}))_{s,t}^\alpha = \int_s^t \int_s^{t_i} \cdots \int_s^{t_2} d\mathbf{x}_{t_1}^{\alpha_1} \cdots d\mathbf{x}_{t_{i-1}}^{\alpha_{r-1}} d\mathbf{x}_{t_i}^{\alpha_r},$$

where the second equality holds because of Lemma 7.5.

Proposition 7.6 *We take $\mathbf{x} \in C^{p\text{-var}}([0,T]; G^{\lfloor p \rfloor}(\mathbb{R}^m))$. Let $\gamma^1, \ldots, \gamma^p$ be multi-indices in Γ. We denote $r = |\gamma^1| + \cdots + |\gamma^p|$ and $\vec{\tau} = (\tau_1, \ldots, \tau_p)$ such that $\tau_i = |\gamma^1| + \cdots + |\gamma^i|$, $i = 1, \ldots, p$. Denote $\gamma = (\gamma^1, \ldots, \gamma^p) \in \Gamma$. Then*

$$\int_s^t \int_s^{t_p} \cdots \int_s^{t_2} d\mathbf{x}_{s,t_1}^{\gamma^1} \cdots d\mathbf{x}_{s,t_{p-1}}^{\gamma^{p-1}} d\mathbf{x}_{s,t_p}^{\gamma^p} = \sum_{\rho \in \Xi_r(\vec{\tau})} x_{s,t}^{\gamma \circ \rho^{-1}}\,.$$

8 Appendix

8.1 Estimates of some multiple integrals

In this subsection we provide some estimates on multiple Riemann-Stieltjes integrals needed in this paper. We also refer to [6] for more studies.

We take $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\beta_j \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$, $j = 1, \dots, r$, and $s, s' \in [0, T]$. Let g^j be a Hölder continuous function of order β_j on $[s, s']$ for $j = 1, \dots, m$. In this subsection, we consider the following multiple integral,

$$g^{\alpha}_{s,t} := \int_s^t \int_s^{s_1} \cdots \int_s^{s_{r-1}} dg^1_{s_r} \cdots dg^{r-1}_{s_2} dg^r_{s_1}\,, \tag{8.1}$$

where $\alpha = (1, \dots, r)$.

Recall that for $f \in C^{\beta'}$ and $h \in C^{\beta}$ such that $\beta + \beta' > 1$, we have the following estimate (see, for instance, [7]):

$$\left| \int_s^t f dh \right| \;\leq\; K \left[\|f\|_{s,t,\infty} + \|f\|_{s,t,\beta'} (t-s)^{\beta'} \right] \|h\|_{\beta} (t-s)^{\beta}. \tag{8.2}$$

The following lemma provides an estimate for (8.1), which is obtained applying repeatedly (8.2).

Lemma 8.1 *There exists a constant $K > 0$ such that for $t, t' \in [s, s']$, we have*

$$\left| g^{\alpha}_{s,t'} - g^{\alpha}_{s,t} \right| \leq K \left(\prod_{j=1}^{r} \|g^j\|_{s,s',\beta_j} \right) (s - s')^{\sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \beta_j} (t' - t)^{\beta_r}. \tag{8.3}$$

Proof: We prove the lemma by induction. The inequality is clear when $r = 1$. Suppose the lemma is true for $1, \dots, r-1$. In the case $\beta_r = 1$, we have

$$\left| g^{\alpha}_{s,t'} - g^{\alpha}_{s,t} \right| = \left| \int_t^{t'} g^{\alpha-}_{s,u} dg^r_u \right| \leq \|g^r\|_{s,s',\beta_r} \sup_{[s,s']} \left| g^{\alpha-}_{s,\cdot} \right| (t' - t). \tag{8.4}$$

By induction assumption we have

$$\left| g^{\alpha-}_{s,t} \right| \leq K \left(\prod_{j=1}^{r-1} \|g^j\|_{s,s',\beta_j} \right) (s' - s)^{\sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \beta_j}, \quad s_1 \in [s, s']\,.$$

Substituting the above inequality into (8.4) we obtain the estimate (8.3).

In the case $\beta_r \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, it follows from inequality (8.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| g^{\alpha}_{s,t'} - g^{\alpha}_{s,t} \right| \;&=\; \left| \int_t^{t'} g^{\alpha-}_{s,u} dg^r_u \right| \\ &\leq\; K \left(\sup_{[s,s']} |g^{\alpha-}_{s,\cdot}| + \|g^{\alpha-}_{s,\cdot}\|_{s,s',\beta_{r-1}} (s' - s)^{\beta_{r-1}} \right) \|g^r\|_{s,s',\beta_r} (t' - t)^{\beta_r}. \end{aligned} \tag{8.5}$$

By induction assumption we have

$$\left\| g^{\alpha-}_{s,\cdot} \right\|_{s,s',\infty} \leq K \left(\prod_{j=1}^{r-1} \|g^j\|_{s,s',\beta_j} \right) (s' - s)^{\sum_{j=1}^{r-1} \beta_j},$$

and

$$\left\|g^{\alpha-}_{s,\cdot}\right\|_{s,s',\beta_{r-1}} \leq K\left(\prod_{j=1}^{r-1}\|g^j\|_{s,s',\beta_j}\right)(s'-s)^{\sum_{j=1}^{r-2}\beta_j}.$$

Substituting the above two inequalities into (8.5) we have

$$\left|g^{\alpha}_{s,t'} - g^{\alpha}_{s,t}\right| \leq K\left(\prod_{j=1}^{r-1}\|g^j\|_{s,s',\beta_j}\right)(s'-s)^{\sum_{j=1}^{r-1}\beta_j}\|g^r\|_{s,s',\beta_r}(t'-t)^{\beta_r}.$$

The proof is now complete. □

Let $f_t = (f_t^1, \ldots, f_t^r)$, $t \in [0,T]$, be a function in $C^\beta(\mathbb{R}^r)$, where $\beta \in (1/2, 1]$. We denote

$$g^j_{s,t}(f^j) = \int_s^t f^j dg^j,$$

and

$$g^{\alpha}_{s,t}(f^\alpha) = \int_s^t \cdots \int_s^{s_2} f^1_{s_1} dg^1_{s_1} \cdots f^r_{s_r} dg^r_{s_r}.$$

Lemma 8.2 *There exists a constant $K > 0$ such that for $t, t' \in [s, s']$, we have*

$$\left|g^{\alpha}_{s,t'}(f^\alpha) - g^{\alpha}_{s,t}(f^\alpha)\right| \leq K(s-s')^{\sum_{j=1}^{r-1}\beta_j}(t'-t)^{\beta_r}\left(\prod_{j=1}^{r}\|g^j\|_{s,s',\beta_j}(\|f^j\|_{s,s',\infty} + \|f^j\|_{s,s',\beta})\right).$$

Proof Applying Lemma 8.1 yields

$$\left|g^{\alpha}_{s,t'}(f^\alpha) - g^{\alpha}_{s,t}(f^\alpha)\right| \leq K\left(\prod_{j=1}^{r}\|g^j_{s,\cdot}(f^j)\|_{s,s',\beta_j}\right)(s-s')^{\sum_{j=1}^{r-1}\beta_j}(t'-t)^{\beta_r}. \tag{8.6}$$

In the case $\beta_j \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$, it follows from inequality (8.2) that

$$\left\|g^j_{s,\cdot}(f^j)\right\|_{s,s',\beta_j} \leq C(\|f^j\|_{s,s',\infty} + \|f^j\|_{s,s',\beta_j})\|g^j\|_{s,s',\beta_j}. \tag{8.7}$$

In the case $\beta_j = 1$, we have

$$\left\|g^j_{s,\cdot}(f^j)\right\|_{s,s',\beta_j} \leq \|f^j\|_{s,s',\infty}\|g^j\|_{s,s',\beta_j}. \tag{8.8}$$

The lemma then follows by substituting (8.7) and (8.8) into (8.6). □

8.2 Estimates of numerical solutions

In this subsection, we derive upper bound estimates for the numerical solutions. We follow the approaches of [7]. We first state an auxiliary result that provides estimates on integrals whose integrands are step functions. We define the seminorm,

$$\|x\|_{a,b,\beta,n} = \sup\left\{\frac{|x_u - x_v|}{|v-u|^\beta};\quad u, v \in D\right\}.$$

Recall that $D = \{kT/n : k = 0, 1, \ldots, n\}$ is a partition of $[0,T]$. When $a = 0$ and $b = T$, we simply write $\|x\|_{\beta,n} = \|x\|_{a,b,\beta,n}$. We will denote $\eta(t) = t_k$ for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1})$.

Lemma 8.3 *Let $y = \{y_t, t \in [0,T]\}$ be a function with values in $\mathbb{R}^m$ such that $\|y\|_{\beta,n} < \infty$, $n \geq 1$. Take $V \in C_b^1(\mathbb{R}^m)$, and $x \in C^{\beta'}([0,T])$ such that $\beta + \beta' > 1$. Then for $s,t \in D$ such that $s < t$ we have*

$$\left| \int_s^t V(y_{\eta(r)}) dx_r \right| \leq K \left[1 + \|y\|_{s,t,\beta,n} (t-s)^{\beta} \right] \|x\|_{\beta'} (t-s)^{\beta'},$$

where the K is a constant depending on β, β', $\|V\|_\infty$ and $\|\partial V\|_\infty$.

Proof See [7]. □

Assume that $g = (g^1, \ldots, g^m)$ and $g^i \in C^\beta([0,T])$, $i = 1, \ldots, m$ for $\beta > \frac{1}{2}$. We fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and the partition of $[0,T]$ given by $t_i = i\frac{T}{n}$, $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$. Consider the following differential equation,

$$y_t = y_0 + \sum_{l=1}^{N} \sum_{\alpha \in \Gamma_l} \int_0^t \varphi_\alpha(y_{\eta(s)}) dg^\alpha_{\eta(s),s}, \ t \in [0,T], \tag{8.9}$$

where $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is some constant, and φ_α, $\alpha \in \cup_{l=1}^N \Gamma_l$ are functions with values in $\mathbb{R}^{d \times m}$. Recall that Γ_l is the collection of multi-indices of length l with elements in $\{1, \ldots, m\}$. We shall derive some estimates for the Hölder seminorm and supremum norm of the solution of this equation.

The constants appearing in the following results depend on β, T, $\|\varphi_\alpha\|_\infty$ and $\|\partial\varphi_\alpha\|_\infty$ for $\alpha \in \Gamma$ of length less or equal to N.

Lemma 8.4 *Let y be the solution of equation (8.9). Assume that $\varphi_\alpha \in C_b^1$ for $\alpha \in \cup_{l=1}^N \Gamma_l$. Then there exists a positive constant C such that*

$$\|y\|_\beta \leq C\|g\|_\beta \vee \|g\|_\beta^{1/\beta + N - 1}, \tag{8.10}$$

and

$$\|y\|_\infty \leq |y_0| + C\|g\|_\beta \vee \|g\|_\beta^{1/\beta + N - 1}. \tag{8.11}$$

Furthermore, there exists $K_0 > 0$ such that for $s,t \in [0,T]$ and $\|g\|_\beta |t-s|^\beta \leq K_0$, we have

$$\|y\|_{s,t,\beta} \leq K\|g\|_\beta \vee \|g\|_\beta^N. \tag{8.12}$$

Proof Let $s,t \in [0,T]$ be such that $s < t$. It follows from (8.9) that

$$\begin{aligned} |y_t - y_s| &\leq \sum_{j=1}^m \left| \int_s^t \varphi_j(y_{\eta(u)}) dg^j_u \right| \\ &\quad + \sum_{l=2}^N \sum_{\alpha \in \Gamma_l} \left| \int_s^t \varphi_\alpha(y_{\eta(u)}) dg^\alpha_{\eta(u),u} \right|. \end{aligned} \tag{8.13}$$

We first derive an estimate for $\|y\|_{\beta,n}$. Assume that $s,t \in D$, that is, $s = \eta(s)$ and $t = \eta(t)$. Applying Lemma 8.3 to the first term on the right-hand side of the above inequality yields

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \left| \int_s^t \varphi_j(y_{\eta(s)}) dg^j_s \right| \leq C(1 + \|y\|_{s,t,\beta,n}(t-s)^\beta) \|g\|_\beta (t-s)^\beta. \tag{8.14}$$

On the other hand, for $\alpha \in \Gamma_l$ with $l = 1, \ldots, N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_s^t \varphi_\alpha(y_{\eta(u)}) dg^\alpha_{\eta(u),u} \right| &\leq \sum_{k=ns/T}^{nt/T-1} \left| \int_{t_k}^{t_{k+1}} \varphi_\alpha(y_{t_k}) dg^\alpha_{\eta(u),u} \right| \\ &\leq C \sum_{k=ns/T}^{nt/T-1} |g^\alpha_{t_k,t_{k+1}}| \leq Cn(t-s)(n^{-\beta}\|g\|_\beta)^l = Cn^{1-\beta l}(t-s)\|g\|_\beta^l, \end{aligned} \tag{8.15}$$

where the third inequality follows from Lemma 8.1. So, the second term on the right-hand side of (8.13) is bounded by

$$\sum_{l=2}^{N}\sum_{\alpha\in\Gamma_l}\left|\int_s^t \varphi_\alpha(y_{\eta(u)})dg^\alpha_{\eta(u),u}\right| \le C(t-s)\sum_{l=2}^{N}\|g\|^l_\beta. \tag{8.16}$$

Substituting (8.14) and (8.16) into (8.13), we obtain

$$|y_t-y_s| \le C\|y\|_{s,t,\beta,n}\|g\|_\beta(t-s)^{2\beta} + C(t-s)^\beta\sum_{l=1}^{N}\|g\|^l_\beta\,.$$

Dividing both sides of the above inequality by $(t-s)^\beta$, and then taking the seminorm $\|\cdot\|_{s,t,\beta,n}$ on the left-hand side we obtain

$$\|y\|_{s,t,\beta,n} \le C\|y\|_{s,t,\beta,n}\|g\|_\beta(t-s)^\beta + C\sum_{l=1}^{N}\|g\|^l_\beta\,. \tag{8.17}$$

If we assume that $T/n \le \frac{1}{2}(2C\|g\|_\beta)^{-1/\beta}$, then we can find an integer k_0 such that

$$\frac{1}{2}(2C\|g\|_\beta)^{-1/\beta} \le k_0T/n \le (2C\|g\|_\beta)^{-1/\beta}. \tag{8.18}$$

Denote $\Delta := k_0T/n$ and take u,v such that $u-v=\Delta$, then from the second inequality in (8.18) we have

$$C\|g\|_\beta(u-v)^\beta \;\le\; \frac{1}{2}.$$

Applying this inequality to (8.17) we obtain

$$\|y\|_{v,u,\beta,n} \le \frac{1}{2}\|y\|_{v,u,\beta,n} + C\sum_{l=1}^{N}\|g\|^l_\beta\,,$$

or

$$\|y\|_{v,u,\beta,n} \le 2C\sum_{l=1}^{N}\|g\|^l_\beta\,. \tag{8.19}$$

This inequality provides the upper bound for $\|y\|_{v,u,\beta,n}$ for $u,v\in D: v-u=\Delta$.

For any $s,t\in D$ such that $t-s>\Delta$.

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{|y_t-y_s|}{(t-s)^\beta} &\le \frac{|y_{s+\Delta}-y_s|}{(t-s)^\beta} + \frac{|y_{s+2\Delta}-y_{s+\Delta}|}{(t-s)^\beta} + \cdots + \frac{|y_t-y_{s+\lfloor\frac{t-s}{\Delta}\rfloor\Delta}|}{(t-s)^\beta}\\ &\le (\lfloor\frac{t-s}{\Delta}\rfloor+1)\sup_{v\in[0,T-\Delta]}\|y\|_{v,v+\Delta,\beta,n}\frac{\Delta^\beta}{(t-s)^\beta}\,.\end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over $s,t\in D$ on both sides of the above inequality and taking into account (8.19), we obtain

$$\|y\|_{\beta,n} \le C(\frac{T}{\Delta}+1)^{1-\beta}(2C\sum_{l=1}^{N}\|g\|^l_\beta)\,.$$

From the first inequality in (8.18) we have

$$(\frac{T}{\Delta}+1)^{1-\beta} \le C(\|g\|_\beta^{1/\beta-1}+1).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\|y\|_{\beta,n} &\le C(\|g\|_\beta^{1/\beta-1}+1)(\sum_{l=1}^{N}\|g\|_\beta^l)\\ &\le C\|g\|_\beta \vee \|g\|_\beta^{1/\beta+N-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{8.20}$$

If we assume that $T/n \ge \frac{1}{2}(2C\|g\|_\beta)^{-1/\beta}$ or $n \le 2T(2C\|g\|_\beta)^{1/\beta}$. Applying (8.15) to (8.13) we obtain

$$|y_t - y_s| \le \sum_{l=1}^{N} Cn^{1-\beta l}(t-s)\|g\|_\beta^l.$$

Dividing both sides of the above inequality by $(t-s)^\beta$, and then taking the supremum over all $s,t \in D$, we obtain

$$\|y\|_{\beta,n} \le \sum_{l=1}^{N} Cn^{1-\beta l}\|g\|_\beta^l.$$

Since $n \le 2T(2C\|g\|_\beta)^{1/\beta}$, we have

$$\|y\|_{\beta,n} \le C\|g\|_\beta^{1/\beta} + \sum_{l=2}^{N} C\|g\|_\beta^l. \tag{8.21}$$

Combining (8.20) and (8.21) we obtain the estimate

$$\|y\|_{\beta,n} \le C\|g\|_\beta \vee \|g\|_\beta^{1/\beta+N-1}. \tag{8.22}$$

It follows from inequality (8.13) that for $s,t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$, $k = 0,1,\dots,n-1$,

$$\|y\|_{s,t,\beta} \le \sum_{l=1}^{N}\|g\|_\beta. \tag{8.23}$$

For any $s,t \in [0,T]$, we have

$$\frac{|y_t - y_s|}{|t-s|^\beta} \le \frac{|y_{\eta(s)+\frac{T}{n}} - y_s|}{|\eta(s)+\frac{T}{n}-s|^\beta} + \frac{|y_{\eta(t)} - y_{\eta(s)-\frac{T}{n}}|}{|\eta(t)-\eta(s)+\frac{T}{n}|^\beta} + \frac{|y_t - y_{\eta(t)}|}{|t-\eta(t)|^\beta}.$$

We apply (8.23) to the first and third term on the right-hand side of the above inequality and apply (8.22) to the second term to obtain

$$\frac{|y_t - y_s|}{|t-s|^\beta} \le C\|g\|_\beta \vee \|g\|_\beta^{1/\beta+N-1}.$$

The estimate (8.10) then follows by taking the supremum over $s,t \in [0,T]$ on the above left-hand side.

The estimate of $\|y\|_\infty$ follows immediately from (8.10). Indeed, by the definition of $\|\cdot\|_\beta$ we have

$$|y_t| \le |y_0| + T^\beta(C\|g\|_\beta \vee \|g\|_\beta^{1/\beta+N-1}).$$

Taking the supremum of $|y_t|$ over $t \in [0,T]$ we obtain (8.11).

Finally, it is easy to derive inequality (8.12) from (8.17). □

References

[1] Baudoin, F; Zhang, X. (2012). Taylor expansion for the solution of a stochastic differential equation driven by fractional Brownian motions. *Electron. J. Probab.* **17**, no. 51, 1-21.

[2] Feng, Q. and Zhang, X. (2015). Taylor expansions and Castell estimates for solutions of stochastic differential equations driven by rough paths. *Arxiv: 1209.4624v3.*

[3] Friz, P. K. and Victoir, N. (2010). *Multidimentional stochastic processes as rough paths, theory and applications.* vol. 120 of *Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

[4] Gradinaru, M. and Nourdin, I. (2009). Milstein's type schemes for fractional SDEs. *Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré Probab. Stat.* **45**, 1085-1098.

[5] Hu, Y. (1996). Strong and weak order of time discretization schemes of stochastic differential equations. *Séminaire de Probabilités XXX* , Lecture Notes in Math. **1626**, 218-227, Springer, Berlin.

[6] Hu, Y. (2013). Multiple integrals and expansion of solutions of differential equations driven by rough paths and by fractional Brownian motions. *Stochastics* **85**, no. 5, 859-916.

[7] Hu, Y.; Liu, Y. and Nualart, D. (2014). Rate of convergence and asymptotic error distribution of Euler approximation schemes for fractional diffusions. To appear in *Ann. Appl. Probab.*

[8] Hu, Y. and Øksendal, B. (2003). Fractional white noise calculus and applications to finance, *Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top.* **6** (1), 1-32.

[9] Janson, S. (1997). *Gaussian Hilbert Spaces.* Cambridge University Press.

[10] Kloeden, P. E. and Platen, E. (1992). *Numerical solution of stochastic differential equations.* Springer.

[11] Lyons, T. (1994). Differential equations driven by rough signals. I. An extension of an inequality of L. C. Young. *Math. Res. Lett.* **1**, 451-464.

[12] Lyons, T. (1998). Differential equations driven by rough signals. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana* **14**, no. 2, 215-310.

[13] Mishura, Y. (2008). *Stochastic Calculus for Fractional Brownian Motion and Related Processes.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

[14] Neuenkirch, A. and Nourdin, I. (2007). Exact rate of convergence of some approximation schemes associated to SDEs driven by a fractional Brownian motion. *J. Theoret. Probab.* **20**, 871-899.

[15] Nualart, D. and Rascanu, A. (2002). Differential equations driven by fractional Brownian motion. *Collect. Math.* **53**, 55-81.

[16] Reutenauer, C. (1993). *Free Lie algebra.* vol. 7 of London Mathematical Society Monographs. New Series. Oxford University Press.

[17] Zähle, M. (1998). Integration with respect to fractal functions and stochastic calculus. I. *Probab. Theory Related Fields* **111**, 333-374.